





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



Statesman Edition

VOL. XV

Charles Sumner

HIS COMPLETE WORKS

With Introduction

BY

HON. GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR



BOSTON

LEE AND SHEPARD

MCM

143599
171817

COPYRIGHT, 1875 AND 1877,
BY
FRANCIS V. BALCH, EXECUTOR.

COPYRIGHT, 1900,
BY
LEE AND SHEPARD.

Statesman Edition.
LIMITED TO ONE THOUSAND COPIES.
OF WHICH THIS IS

No. 565 -

Norwood Press :
NORWOOD, MASS., U.S.A.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XV.

	PAGE
THE CESSION OF RUSSIAN AMERICA TO THE UNITED STATES. Speech in the Senate, on the Ratification of the Treaty between the United States and Russia, April 9, 1867 . . .	1
PRECAUTION AGAINST THE PRESIDENT. Remarks in the Sen- ate, on a Resolution asking for Copies of Opinions with regard to the Tenure-of-Office Law and Appointments during the Recess of Congress, April 11, 1867 . . .	170
FINISH OUR WORK BEFORE ADJOURNMENT. Remarks in the Senate, on a Motion to adjourn without Day, April 11 and 12, 1867	172
MEDIATION BETWEEN CONTENDING PARTIES IN MEXICO. Reso- lution in the Senate, proposing the Good Offices of the United States, April 20, 1867	174
EQUAL SUFFRAGE AT ONCE BY ACT OF CONGRESS RATHER THAN CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Letter to the New York Independent, April 20, 1867	176
CELEBRATION AT ARLINGTON, ON ASSUMING ITS NEW NAME. Speech at a Dinner in a Tent, June 17, 1867	181
POWERS OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS IN THE ABSENCE OF A QUORUM. Protest in the Senate, at its Opening, July 3, 1867	185
HOMESTEADS FOR FREEDMEN. Resolution in the Senate, July 3, 1867	188
LIMITATION OF THE BUSINESS OF THE SENATE. OBLIGATIONS OF SENATE CAUCUSES. Speeches in the Senate, July 3, 5, and 10, 1867	189

	PAGE
RECONSTRUCTION ONCE MORE. PUBLIC SCHOOLS; OFFICERS AND SENATORS WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF COLOR. Speeches in the Senate, on the Third Reconstruction Bill, July 11 and 13, 1867	217
SUFFRAGE WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF COLOR THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES BY ACT OF CONGRESS. Remarks in the Senate, on a Bill to enforce Several Provisions of the Constitution by securing the Elective Franchise to Colored Citizens, July 12, 1867	229
OPENING OF OFFICES TO COLORED PERSONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. Remarks in the Senate, on a Bill for the further Security of Equal Rights in the District of Columbia, July 16, 1867	234
NATURALIZATION WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF RACE OR COLOR. Remarks in the Senate, on a Bill to strike out the Word "White" in the Naturalization Laws, July 19, 1867	238
THE PRESIDENT MUST BE WATCHED BY CONGRESS, OR RE- MOVED. Speech in the Senate, on the Resolution of Adjournment, July 19, 1867	240
SYMPATHY WITH CRETE, AND AN APPEAL TO THE TURKISH GOVERNMENT. Joint Resolutions in the Senate, July 19, 1867, and July 21, 1868	246
PRIVILEGES OF DEBATE IN THE SENATE ON OFFICERS LIABLE TO IMPEACHMENT. Resolutions in the Senate, July 20, 1867	249
PROPHETIC VOICES CONCERNING AMERICA. A Monograph	251

THE CESSION OF RUSSIAN AMERICA TO THE UNITED STATES.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, ON THE RATIFICATION OF THE TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA, APRIL 9, 1867.

Thirteen governments founded on the natural authority of the people alone, without a pretence of miracle or mystery, and *which are destined to spread over the northern part of that whole quarter of the globe*, are a great point gained in favor of the rights of mankind. — JOHN ADAMS, *Preface to his Defence of the American Constitutions*, dated Grosvenor Square, London, January 1, 1787: Works, Vol. IV. p. 293.

Barbarous and stupid Xerxes, how vain was all thy toil to cover ~~the~~ Hellespont with a floating bridge ! Thus rather wise and prudent ~~princes~~ join Asia to Europe; they join and fasten nations together, not with boards or planks or surging brigandines, not with inanimate and insensible bonds, but by the ties of legitimate love, chaste nuptials, and the infallible gage of progeny. — PLUTARCH, *Morals*, ed. Goodwin, Vol. I. p. 482.

LATE in the evening of Friday, March 29, 1867, Mr. Sumner, on reaching home, found this note from Mr. Seward awaiting him: "Can you come to my house this evening? I have a matter of public business in regard to which it is desirable that I should confer with you at once." Without delay he hurried to the house of the Secretary of State, only to find that the latter had left for the Department. His son, the Assistant Secretary, was at home, and he was soon joined by Mr. de Stoeckl, the Russian Minister. From the two Mr. Sumner learned for the first time that a treaty was about to be signed for the cession of Russian America to the United States. With a map in his hand, the Minister, who had just returned from St. Petersburg, explained the proposed boundary, according to verbal instructions from the Archduke Constantine. After a brief conversation, when Mr. Sumner inquired and listened without expressing any opinion, they left together, the Minister on his way to the Department, where the treaty was copying. The clock was striking midnight as they parted, the Minister saying with interest, "You will not fail us." The treaty was signed about four o'clock in the morning of March 30th, being the last day of the current session of Congress, and on the same day transmitted to the Senate, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

April 1st, the Senate was convened in Executive session by the proclamation of the President of the United States, and the Committee proceeded to the consideration of the treaty. The Committee at the time was Messrs. Sumner (Chairman), Fessenden, of Maine, Cameron, of Pennsylvania, Harlan, of Iowa, Morton, of Indiana, Patterson, of New Hampshire, and Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland. Carefully and anxiously they considered the question, and meanwhile it was discussed outside. Among friendly influences was a strong pressure from Hon. Thaddeus Stevens, the acknowledged leader of the other House, who, though without constitutional voice on the ratification of a treaty, could not restrain his earnest testimony. Mr. Sumner was controlled less by desire for more territory than by a sense of the amity of Russia, manifested especially during our recent troubles, and by an unwillingness to miss the opportunity of dismissing another European sovereign from our continent, predestined, as he believed, to become the broad, undivided home of the American people; and these he developed in his remarks before the Senate.

April 8th, the treaty was reported by Mr. Sumner without amendment, and with the recommendation that the Senate advise and consent thereto. The next day it was considered, when Mr. Sumner spoke on the negotiation, its origin, and the character of the ceded possessions. A motion by Mr. Fessenden to postpone its further consideration was voted down, — Yeas 12, Nays 29. After further debate, the final question of ratification was put and carried on the same day by a vote of Yeas 37, Nays 2, — the Nays being Mr. Fessenden, and Mr. Morrill, of Vermont. The ratifications were exchanged June 20th, and the same day the treaty was proclaimed.

The debate was in Executive session, and no reporters were present. Senators interested in the question invited Mr. Sumner to write out his remarks and give them to the public. For some time he hesitated, but, taking advantage of the vacation, he applied himself to the work, following precisely in order and subdivision the notes of a single page from which he spoke.

The speech was noticed at home and abroad. At home, the *Boston Journal*, which published it at length, remarked : —

“This speech, it will be remembered, coming from the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and abounding in a mass of pertinent information not otherwise accessible to Senators, exerted a most marked, if not decisive, effect in favor of the ratification of the treaty. Since then, the rumors of Mr. Sumner's exhaustive treatment of the subject, together with the increasing popular interest in our new territory, have stimulated a general desire for the publication of the speech, which we are now enabled to supply. As might be expected, the speech is a monument of comprehensive research, and of skill in the collection and arrangement of facts. It probably comprises about all the information that is extant concerning our new Pacific possessions, and will prove equally interesting to the student of history, the politician, and the man of business.”

A Russian translation, by Mr. Buynitzky, appeared at St. Petersburg, with an introduction, whose complimentary character is manifest in its opening : —

“Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, appears, since the election of Lincoln, as one of the most eloquent and conspicuous representatives of the Republican party. His name stands in the first rank of the zealous propagators of Abolitionism, and all his political activity is directed toward one object, — the completion of the glorious act of enfranchisement of five millions of citizens by a series of laws calculated to secure to freedmen the actual possession of civil and political rights. As Chairman of the Senate Committee upon Foreign Relations, Mr. Sumner

attentively watches the march of affairs in Europe generally; but, in the course of the present decade, his particular attention was attracted by the reforms which took place in Russia. The emancipation of the peasants in our country was viewed with the liveliest sympathy by the American statesman, and this sympathy expressed itself eloquently in his speeches, delivered on various occasions, as well in Congress as in the State conventions of Massachusetts."

A French writer, M. Cochin, whose work on Slavery is an important contribution to the literature of Emancipation, in a later work thus characterizes this speech:—

"All that is known on Russian America has just been presented in a speech, abundant, erudite, eloquent, poetic, pronounced before the Congress of the United States by the great orator, Charles Sumner."¹

On the appearance of the speech, May 24th, Professor Baird, the accomplished naturalist of the Smithsonian Institution, wrote, expressing the hope that some Boston or New York publisher would reprint what he called the "Essay" in a "book-form," adding: "It deserves some more permanent dress than that of a speech from the *Globe* office." This is done for the first time in the present publication.

These few notices, taken from many, are enough to show the contemporary reception of the speech.

¹ *Conférences Américaines*, p. 143.

S P E E C H .

MR. PRESIDENT, — You have just listened to the reading of the treaty by which Russia cedes to the United States all her possessions on the North American continent and the adjacent islands in consideration of \$7,200,000 to be paid by the United States. On the one side is the cession of a vast country, with its jurisdiction and resources of all kinds; on the other side is the purchase-money. Such is the transaction on its face.

BOUNDARIES AND CONFIGURATION.

IN endeavoring to estimate its character, I am glad to begin with what is clear and beyond question. I refer to the boundaries fixed by the treaty. Commencing at the parallel of $54^{\circ} 40'$ north latitude, so famous in our history, the line ascends Portland Canal to the mountains, which it follows on their summits to the point of intersection with the meridian of 141° west longitude, which it ascends to the Frozen Ocean, or, if you please, to the north pole. This is the eastern boundary, separating the region from the British possessions, and it is borrowed from the treaty between Russia and Great Britain in 1825, establishing the relations between these two powers on this continent. It is seen that this boundary is old; the rest is new. Starting from the Frozen Ocean, the western boundary descends Behring

Strait, midway between the two islands of Krusenstern and Ratmanoff, to the parallel of $65^{\circ} 30'$, just below where the continents of America and Asia approach each other the nearest; and from this point it proceeds in a course nearly southwest through Behring Strait, midway between the island of St. Lawrence and Cape Chukotski, to the meridian of 172° west longitude, and thence, in a southwesterly direction, traversing Behring Sea, midway between the island of Attoo on the east and Copper Island on the west, to the meridian of 193° west longitude, leaving the prolonged group of the Aleutian Islands in the possessions transferred to the United States, and making the western boundary of our country the dividing line which separates Asia from America.

Look at the map and observe the configuration of this extensive region, whose estimated area is more than five hundred and seventy thousand square miles. I speak by authority of our own Coast Survey. Including the Sitkan Archipelago at the south, it takes a margin of the main-land fronting on the ocean thirty miles broad and five hundred miles long to Mount St. Elias, the highest peak of the continent, when it turns with an elbow to the west, and along Behring Strait northerly, then rounding to the east along the Frozen Ocean. Here are upwards of four thousand statute miles of coast, indented by capacious bays and commodious harbors without number, embracing the peninsula of Alaska, one of the most remarkable in the world, twenty-five miles in breadth and three hundred miles in length; piled with mountains, many volcanic and some still smoking; penetrated by navigable rivers, one of which is among the largest of the world; studded

with islands standing like sentinels on the coast, and flanked by that narrow Aleutian range which, starting from Alaska, stretches far away to Kamtchatka, as if America were extending a friendly hand to Asia. This is the most general aspect. There are details specially disclosing maritime advantages and approaches to the sea which properly belong to this preliminary sketch. According to accurate estimate, the coast line, including bays and islands, is not less than eleven thousand two hundred and seventy miles. In the Aleutian range, besides innumerable islets and rocks, there are not less than fifty-five islands exceeding three miles in length; there are seven exceeding forty miles, with Oonimak, which is the largest, exceeding seventy-three miles. In our part of Behring Sea there are five considerable islands, the largest of which is St. Lawrence, being more than ninety-six miles long. Add to all these the group south of the peninsula of Alaska, including the Shumagins and the magnificent island of Kadiak, and then the Sitkan group, being archipelago added to archipelago, and the whole together constituting the geographical complement to the West Indies, so that the northwest of the continent answers to the southeast, archipelago for archipelago.

DISCOVERY OF RUSSIAN AMERICA BY BEHRING, UNDER INSTRUCTIONS FROM PETER THE GREAT.

THE title of Russia to all these possessions is derived from prior discovery, being the admitted title by which all European powers have held in North and South America, unless we except what England acquired by conquest from France; but here the title

of France was derived from prior discovery. Russia, shut up in a distant interior and struggling with barbarism, was scarcely known to the other powers at the time they were lifting their flags in the western hemisphere. At a later day the same powerful genius which made her known as an empire set in motion the enterprise by which these possessions were opened to her dominion. Peter, called the Great, himself ship-builder and reformer, who had worked in the ship-yards of England and Holland, was curious to know if Asia and America were separated by the sea, or if they constituted one undivided body with different names, like Europe and Asia. To obtain this information, he wrote with his own hand the following instructions, and ordered his chief admiral to see them carried into execution:—

“One or two boats with decks to be built at Kamtschatka, or at any other convenient place, with which inquiry should be made in relation to the northerly coasts, to see whether they were not contiguous with America, since their end was not known. And this done, they should see whether they could not somewhere find an harbor belonging to Europeans or an European ship. They should likewise set apart some men who were to inquire after the name and situation of the coasts discovered. Of all this an exact journal should be kept, with which they should return to Petersburg.”¹

The Czar died in the winter of 1725; but the Empress Catharine, faithful to the desires of her husband, did not allow this work to be neglected. Vitus Behring, Dane by birth, and navigator of experience, was made commander. The place of embarkation was on

¹ Müller's *Voyages from Asia to America*, tr. Jefferys, (London, 1764,) p. 45.

the other side of the Asiatic continent. Taking with him officers and ship-builders, the navigator left St. Petersburg by land, 5th February, 1725, and commenced the preliminary journey across Siberia, Northern Asia, and the Sea of Okhotsk, to the coast of Kamtchatka, which they reached only after infinite hardships and delays, sometimes with dogs for horses, and sometimes supporting life by eating leather bags, straps, and shoes. More than three years were consumed in this toilsome and perilous journey. At last, on the 20th of July, 1728, the party was able to set sail in a small vessel, called the *Gabriel*, and described as "like the packet-boats used in the Baltic." Steering in a northeasterly direction, Behring passed a large island, which he called St. Lawrence, from the saint on whose day it was seen. This island, which is included in the present cession, may be considered as the first point in Russian discovery, as it is also the first outpost of the North American continent. Continuing northward, and hugging the Asiatic coast, Behring turned back only when he thought he had reached the northeastern extremity of Asia, and was satisfied that the two continents were separated from each other. He did not penetrate further north than $67^{\circ} 30'$.

In his voyage Behring was struck by the absence of such great and high waves as in other places are common to the open sea, and he observed fir-trees swimming in the water, although they were unknown on the Asiatic coast. Relations of inhabitants, in harmony with these indications, pointed to "a country at no great distance towards the east." His work was still incomplete, and the navigator, before returning home, put forth again for this discovery, but without

success. By another dreary land journey he made his way back to St. Petersburg in March, 1730, after an absence of five years. Something was accomplished for Russian discovery, and his own fame was engraved on the maps of the world. The strait through which he sailed now bears his name, as also does the expanse of sea he traversed on his way to the strait.

The spirit of discovery continued at St. Petersburg. A Cossack chief, undertaking to conquer the obstinate natives on the northeastern coast, proposed also "to discover the pretended country in the Frozen Sea." He was killed by an arrow before his enterprise was completed. Little is known of the result; but it is stated that the navigator whom he had selected, by name Gwosdeff, in 1730 succeeded in reaching "a strange coast" between sixty-five and sixty-six degrees of north latitude, where he saw people, but could not speak with them for want of an interpreter. This must have been the coast of North America, and not far from the group of islands in Behring Strait, through which the present boundary passes, separating the United States from Russia, and America from Asia.

The Russian desire to get behind the curtain increased. Behring volunteered to undertake the discoveries yet remaining. He was created Commodore, and his old lieutenants were created captains. The Senate, the Admiralty, and the Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg, all united in the enterprise. Several academicians were appointed to report on the natural history of the coasts visited, among whom was Steller, the naturalist, said to be "immortal" from this association. All of these, with a numerous body of officers, journeyed across Siberia, Northern Asia, and the Sea

of Okhotsk, to Kamtchatka, as Behring had journeyed before. Though ordered in 1732, the expedition was not able to leave the eastern coast until 4th June, 1741, when two well-appointed ships set sail in company "to discover the continent of America." One of these, called the *St. Peter*, was under Commodore Behring; the other, called the *St. Paul*, was under Captain Tschirikoff. For some time the two kept together, but in a violent storm and fog they were separated, when each continued the expedition alone.

Behring first saw the continent of North America 18th July, 1741, in latitude $58^{\circ} 28'$. Looking at it from a distance, "the country had terrible high mountains that were covered with snow." Two days later, he anchored in a sheltered bay near a point, which he called, from the saint's day on which he saw it, Cape *St. Elias*. He was in the shadow of Mount *St. Elias*. Landing, he found deserted huts, fireplaces, hewn wood, household furniture, arrows, "a whetstone on which it appeared that copper knives had been sharpened," and "store of red salmon." Here also birds unknown in Siberia were noticed by the faithful Steller, among which was the blue-jay, of a peculiar species, now called by his name. At this point, Behring found himself constrained by the elbow in the coast to turn westward, and then in a southerly direction. Hugging the shore, his voyage was constantly arrested by islands without number, among which he zigzagged to find his way. Several times he landed. Once he saw natives, who wore "upper garments of whales' guts, breeches of seal-skins, and caps of the skins of sea-lions, adorned with various feathers, especially those of hawks." These "Americans," as they are called, were fishermen, with-

out bows and arrows. They regaled the Russians with "whale's flesh," but declined strong drink. One of them, on receiving a cup of brandy, "spit the brandy out again as soon as he had tasted it, and cried aloud, as if he was complaining to his countrymen how ill he had been used." This was on one of the Shumagin Islands, near the southern coast of the peninsula of Alaska.

Meanwhile the other solitary ship, proceeding on its way, had sighted the same coast 15th July, 1741, in the latitude of 56°. Anchoring at some distance from the steep and rocky cliffs before him, Tschirikoff sent his mate with the long-boat and ten of his best men, provided with small-arms and a brass cannon, to inquire into the nature of the country and to obtain fresh water. The long-boat disappeared behind a headland, and was never seen again. Thinking it might have been damaged in landing, the captain sent his boatswain with the small boat and carpenters, well armed, to furnish necessary assistance. The small boat disappeared also, and was never seen again. At the same time a great smoke was observed continually ascending from the shore. Shortly afterwards, two boats filled with natives sallied forth and lay at some distance from the vessel, when, crying, "*Agai, Agai*," they put back to the shore. Sorrowfully the Russian navigator turned away, not knowing the fate of his comrades, and unable to help them. This was not far from Sitka.

Such was the first discovery of these northwestern coasts, and such are the first recorded glimpses of the aboriginal inhabitants. The two navigators had different fortunes. Tschirikoff, deprived of his boats, and therefore unable to land, hurried home. Adverse winds

and storms interfered. He supplied himself with fresh water by distilling sea-water or pressing rain-water from the sails. But at last, on the 9th of October, he reached Kamtchatka, with his ship's company of seventy diminished to forty-nine. During this time Behring was driven, like Ulysses, on the uncertain waves. A single tempest raged for seventeen days, so that Andrew Hasselberg, the ancient pilot, who had known the sea for fifty years, declared that he had seen nothing like it in his life. Scurvy came with disheartening horrors. The Commodore himself was a sufferer. Rigging broke; cables snapped; anchors were lost. At last the tempest-tossed vessel was cast upon a desert island, then without a name, where the Commodore, sheltered in a ditch, and half covered with sand as a protection against cold, died, 8th December, 1741. His body, after his decease, was "scraped out of the ground" and buried on this island, which is called by his name, and constitutes an outpost of the Asiatic continent. Thus the Russian navigator, after the discovery of America, died in Asia. Russia, by the recent demarcation, does not fail to retain his last resting-place among her possessions.

TITLE OF RUSSIA.

FOR some time after these expeditions, by which Russia achieved the palm of discovery, imperial enterprise in those seas slumbered. The knowledge already acquired was continued and confirmed only by private individuals, who were led there in quest of furs. In 1745 the Aleutian Islands were discovered by an adventurer in search of sea-otters. In successive voyages all these islands were visited for similar

purposes. Among these was Oonalaska, the principal of the group of Fox Islands, constituting a continuation of the Aleutian Islands, whose inhabitants and productions were minutely described. In 1768 private enterprise was superseded by an expedition ordered by the Empress Catharine, which, leaving Kamtchatka, explored this whole archipelago and the peninsula of Alaska, which to the islanders stood for the whole continent. Shortly afterwards, all these discoveries, beginning with those of Behring and Tschirikoff, were verified by the great English navigator, Captain Cook. In 1778 he sailed along the northwestern coast, "near where Tschirikoff anchored in 1741"; then again in sight of mountains "wholly covered with snow from the highest summit down to the sea-coast," with "the summit of an elevated mountain above the horizon," which he supposed to be the Mount St. Elias of Behring; then by the very anchorage of Behring; then among the islands through which Behring zigzagged, and along the coast by the island of St. Lawrence, until arrested by ice. If any doubt existed with regard to Russian discoveries, it was removed by the authentic report of this navigator, who shed such a flood of light upon the geography of the whole region.

Such from the beginning is the title of Russia, dating at least from 1741. I have not stopped to quote volume and page, but I beg to be understood as following approved authorities, and I refer especially to the Russian work of Müller, already cited, on the "Voyages from Asia to America," the volume of Coxe on "Russian Discoveries," with its supplement on the "Comparative View of the Russian Discoveries," the volume of Sir John Barrow on "Voyages into the Arctic Regions,"

Burney's "Northeastern Voyages," and the third voyage of Captain Cook, unhappily interrupted by his tragical death from the natives of the Sandwich Islands, but not until after the exploration of this coast.

There were at least four other Russian expeditions, by which this title was confirmed, if it needed any confirmation. The first was ordered by the Empress Catharine, in 1785. It was under the command of Commodore Billings, an Englishman in the service of Russia, and was narrated from the original papers by Martin Sauer, secretary of the expedition. In the instructions from the Admiralty at St. Petersburg the Commodore was directed to take possession of "such coasts and islands as he shall first discover, whether inhabited or not, that cannot be disputed, and are not yet subject to any European power, with consent of the inhabitants, if any"; and this was to be accomplished by setting up "posts marked with the arms of Russia, with letters indicating the time of discovery, a short account of the people, their voluntary submission to the Russian sovereignty, and that this was done under the glorious reign of the great Catharine the Second."¹ The next was in 1803-6, in the interest of the Russian American Company, with two ships, one under the command of Captain Krusenstern, and the other of Captain Lisiansky, of the Russian navy. It was the first Russian voyage round the world, and lasted three years. During its progress, Lisiansky visited the northwest coast of America, and especially Sitka and the island of Kadiak. Still another enterprise, organized by the celebrated minister Count Romanzoff, and at

¹ Articles XV., XVI.: Billings's Expedition, Appendix, No. V., pp. 41, 42.

his expense, left Russia in 1815, under the command of Lieutenant Kotzebue, an officer of the Russian navy, and son of the German dramatist, whose assassination darkened the return of the son from his long voyage. It is enough for the present to say of this expedition that it has left its honorable traces on the coast even as far as the Frozen Ocean. There remains the enterprise of Lütke, at the time captain, and afterward admiral in the Russian navy, which was a voyage of circumnavigation, embracing especially the Russian possessions, commenced in 1826, and described in French with instructive fulness. With him sailed the German naturalist Kittlitz, who has done so much to illustrate the natural history of this region.

A FRENCH ASPIRATION ON THIS COAST.

So little was the Russian title recognized for some time, that, when the unfortunate expedition of La Pérouse, with the frigates *Boussole* and *Astrolabe*, stopped on this coast in 1786, he did not hesitate to consider the friendly harbor, in latitude $58^{\circ} 36'$, where he was moored, as open to permanent occupation. Describing this harbor, which he named *Port des Français*, as sheltered behind a breakwater of rocks, with a calm sea and a mouth sufficiently large, he announces that Nature seemed to have created at the extremity of America a port like that of Toulon, but vaster in plan and accommodations; and then, considering that it had never been discovered before, that it was situated thirty-three leagues northwest of Los Remedios, the limit of Spanish navigation, about two hundred and twenty-four leagues from Nootka, and a hundred leagues

from Prince William Sound, the mariner records his judgment, that, "if the French Government had any project of a factory on this part of the coast of America, no nation could pretend to have the slightest right to oppose it."¹ Thus quietly was Russia dislodged. The frigates sailed further on their voyage, and never returned to France. Their fate was unknown, until, after fruitless search and the lapse of a generation, some relics from them were accidentally found on an obscure island of the Southern Pacific. The unfinished journal of La Pérouse, recording his visit to this coast, had been sent overland, by way of Kamtchatka and Siberia, to France, where it was published by a decree of the National Assembly, thus making known his supposed discovery and his aspiration.

EARLY SPANISH CLAIM.

SPAIN also has been a claimant. In 1775, Bodega, a Spanish navigator, seeking new opportunities to plant the Spanish flag, reached the parallel of 58° on this coast, not far from Sitka; but this supposed discovery was not followed by any immediate assertion of dominion. The universal aspiration of Spain had embraced this whole region even at an early day, and shortly after the return of Bodega another enterprise was equipped to verify the larger claim, being nothing less than the original title as discoverer of the strait between America and Asia, and of the conterminous continent, under the name of Anian. This curious episode is not out of place in the present brief history. It has two branches: one concerning early maps, on

¹ Voyage, Tom. II. p. 147.

which straits are represented between America and Asia under the name of Anian; the other concerning a pretended attempt by a Spanish navigator at an early day to find these straits.

There can be no doubt that early maps exist with northwestern straits marked Anian. There are two in the Congressional Library, in atlases of the years 1680 and 1717; but these are of a date comparatively modern. Engel, in his "*Mémoires Géographiques*," mentions several earlier, which he believes genuine. There is one purporting to be by Zaltieri, and bearing date 1566, an authentic pen-and-ink copy of which is now before me, from the collection of our own Coast Survey. On this very interesting map, which is without latitude or longitude, the western coast of the continent is delineated with a strait separating it from Asia not unlike Behring's in outline, and with the name in Italian, *Stretto di Anian*. Southward the coast has a certain conformity with what is now known to exist. Below is an indentation corresponding to Bristol Bay; then a peninsula somewhat broader than that of Alaska; then the elbow of the coast; then, lower down, three islands, not unlike Sitka, Queen Charlotte, and Vancouver; and then, further south, is the peninsula of Lower California. Sometimes the story of Anian is explained by the voyage of the Portuguese navigator Gaspar de Corte-real, in 1500, when, on reaching Hudson Bay in quest of a passage round America, he imagined that he had found it, and proceeded to name his discovery "in honor of two brothers who accompanied him." Very soon maps began to record the Strait of Anian; but this does not explain the substantial conformity of the early delineation with the reality, which seems truly remarkable.

The other branch of inquiry is more easily disposed of. This turns on a Spanish document entitled "A Relation of the Discovery of the Strait of Anian, made by me, Captain Lorenzo Ferrer Maldonado, in the Year 1588."¹ If this early account of a northwest passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific were authentic, the whole question would be settled; but recent geographers indignantly discard it as a barefaced imposture. Clearly Spain once regarded it otherwise; for her Government in 1789 sent out an expedition "to discover the strait by which Laurent Ferrer Maldonado was supposed to have passed, in 1588, from the coast of Labrador to the Great Ocean."² The expedition was unsuccessful, and nothing more has been heard of any claim from this pretended discovery. The story of Maldonado has taken its place in the same category with that of Munchausen.

REASONS FOR CESSION BY RUSSIA.

TURNING from the question of title, which time and testimony have already settled, I meet the inquiry, Why does Russia part with possessions associated with the reign of her greatest ruler and filling an important chapter of geographical history? Here I am without information not open to others. But I do not forget that the first Napoleon, in parting with Louisiana, was controlled by three several considerations. First, he needed the purchase-money for his treasury; secondly, he was unwilling to leave this distant unguarded terri-

¹ A translation of this document is given in Barrow's *Arctic Voyages*, Appendix, No. II., pp. 24, seqq.

² Voyage of Malaspina: Barrow, p. 127.

tory a prey to Great Britain, in the event of hostilities, which seemed at hand; and, thirdly, he was glad, according to his own remarkable language, "to establish forever the power of the United States, and give to England a maritime rival that would sooner or later humble her pride."¹ Such is the record of history. Perhaps a similar record may be made hereafter with regard to the present cession. There is reason to imagine that Russia, with all her great empire, is financially poor; so that these few millions may not be unimportant to her. It is by foreign loans that her railroads have been built and her wars aided. All, too, must see that in those "coming events" which now more than ever "cast their shadows before" it will be for her advantage not to hold outlying possessions from which thus far she has obtained no income commensurate with the possible expense for their protection. Perhaps, like a wrestler, she strips for the contest, which I trust sincerely may be averted. Besides, I cannot doubt that her enlightened Emperor, who has given pledges to civilization by an unsurpassed act of Emancipation, would join the first Napoleon in a desire to enhance the maritime power of the United States.

These general considerations are reinforced, when we call to mind the little influence which Russia has been able thus far to exercise in this region. Though possessing dominion for more than a century, the gigantic power has not been more genial or productive there than the soil itself. Her government is little more than a name or a shadow. It is not even a skeleton. It is hardly visible. Its only representative is a fur company, to which has been added latterly an ice com-

¹ Barbé-Marbois, *Histoire de la Louisiane*, (Paris, 1829,) p. 335.

pany. The immense country is without form and without light, without activity and without progress. Distant from the imperial capital, and separated from the huge bulk of Russian empire, it does not share the vitality of a common country. Its life is solitary and feeble. Its settlements are only encampments or lodges. Its fisheries are only a petty perquisite, belonging to local or personal adventurers rather than to the commerce of nations.

In these statements I follow the record. So little were these possessions regarded during the last century that they were scarcely recognized as a component part of the empire. I have now before me an authentic map, published by the Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg in 1776, and reproduced at London in 1780, entitled "General Map of the Russian Empire,"¹ where you will look in vain for Russian America, unless we except the links of the Aleutian chain nearest to the two continents. Alexander Humboldt, whose geographical insight was unerring, in his great work on New Spain, published in 1811, after stating that he is able from an official document to give the position of the Russian factories on the American continent, says that they are "for the most part mere collections of sheds and cabins, but serving as storehouses for the fur-trade." He remarks further that "the larger part of these small Russian colonies communicate with each other only by sea"; and then, putting us on our guard not to expect too much from a name, he proceeds to say that "the new denomination of 'Russian America,' or 'Russian Possessions on the New Continent,' must not lead us to think that the coasts of Behring's

¹ Prefixed to Coxe's Russian Discoveries (London, 1780).

Basin, the peninsula of Alaska, or the country of the Tchuktchi have become Russian provinces in the sense given to this word in speaking of the Spanish provinces of Sonora or New Biscay."¹ Here is a distinction between the foothold of Spain in California and the foothold of Russia in North America which will at least illustrate the slender power of the latter in this region.

In ceding possessions so little within the sphere of her empire, embracing more than one hundred nations or tribes, Russia gives up no part of herself; and even if she did, the considerable price paid, the alarm of war which begins to fill our ears, and the sentiments of friendship declared for the United States would explain the transaction.

THE NEGOTIATION, IN ITS ORIGIN AND COMPLETION.

I AM not able to say when the idea of this cession first took shape. I have heard that it was as long ago as the Administration of Mr. Polk. It is within my knowledge that the Russian Government was sounded on the subject during the Administration of Mr. Buchanan. This was done through Mr. Gwin, at the time Senator of California, and Mr. Appleton, Assistant Secretary of State. For this purpose the former had more than one interview with the Russian minister at Washington, some time in December, 1859, in which, while professing to speak for the President unofficially, he represented that "Russia was too far off to make the most of these possessions, and that, as we were near, we could derive more from them." In reply to an inquiry

¹ *Essai Politique sur le Royaume de la Nouvelle-Espagne*, Tom. I. pp. 344-346.

of the Russian minister, Mr. Gwin said that "the United States could go as high as \$5,000,000 for the purchase," on which the former made no comment. Mr. Appleton, on another occasion, said to the minister that "the President thought the acquisition would be very profitable to the States on the Pacific; that he was ready to follow it up, but wished to know in advance if Russia was ready to cede; that, if she were, he would confer with his Cabinet and influential members of Congress." All this was unofficial; but it was promptly communicated to the Russian Government, who seem to have taken it into careful consideration. Prince Gortchakoff, in a despatch which reached here early in the summer of 1860, said that "the offer was not what might have been expected, but that it merited mature reflection; that the Minister of Finance was about to inquire into the condition of these possessions, after which Russia would be in a condition to treat." The Prince added for himself, that "he was by no means satisfied personally that it would be for the interest of Russia politically to alienate these possessions; that the only consideration which could make the scales incline that way would be the prospect of great financial advantages, but that the sum of \$5,000,000 did not seem in any way to represent the real value of these possessions"; and he concluded by asking the minister to tell Mr. Appleton and Senator Gwin that the sum offered was not considered "an equitable equivalent." The subject was submerged by the Presidential election which was approaching, and then by the Rebellion. It will be observed that this attempt was at a time when politicians who believed in the perpetuity of Slavery still had power. Mr. Buchanan was Presi-

dent, and he employed as his intermediary a known sympathizer with Slavery, who shortly afterwards became a Rebel. Had Russia been willing, it is doubtful if this controlling interest would have sanctioned any acquisition too far north for Slavery.

Meanwhile the Rebellion was brought to an end, and peaceful enterprise was renewed, which on the Pacific coast was directed toward the Russian possessions. Our people there, wishing new facilities to obtain fish, fur, and ice, sought the intervention of the National Government. The Legislature of Washington Territory, in the winter of 1866, adopted the following memorial to the President of the United States, entitled "In reference to the cod and other fisheries."

"TO HIS EXCELLENCY ANDREW JOHNSON,

"President of the United States.

"Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of Washington Territory, beg leave to show that abundance of codfish, halibut, and salmon, of excellent quality, have been found along the shores of the Russian possessions. Your memorialists respectfully request your Excellency to obtain such rights and privileges of the Government of Russia as will enable our fishing vessels to visit the ports and harbors of its possessions, to the end that fuel, water, and provisions may be easily obtained, that our sick and disabled fishermen may obtain sanitary assistance, together with the privilege of curing fish and repairing vessels in need of repairs. Your memorialists further request that the Treasury Department be instructed to forward to the collector of customs of this Puget Sound district such fishing licenses, abstract journals, and log-books as will enable our hardy fishermen to obtain the bounties now provided and paid to the fishermen in the Atlantic States. Your memorialists finally pray your Excellency to employ such ships as may be spared from the

Pacific naval fleet in exploring and surveying the fishing banks known to navigators to exist along the Pacific coast from the Cortés Bank to Behring Straits. And, as in duty bound, your memorialists will ever pray.

“Passed the House of Representatives January 10, 1866.

“EDWARD ELDRIDGE,

“*Speaker House of Representatives.*

“Passed the Council January 13, 1866.

“HARVEY K. HINES,

“*President of the Council.*”

This memorial, on presentation to the President, in February, 1866, was referred to the Secretary of State, by whom it was communicated to Mr. de Stoeckl, the Russian minister, with remarks on the importance of some early and comprehensive arrangement between the two powers to prevent the growth of difficulties, especially from the fisheries in that region. At the same time reports began to prevail of extraordinary wealth in fisheries, especially the whale and cod, promising to become an important commerce on the Pacific coast.

Shortly afterwards another influence was felt. Mr. Cole, who had been recently elected to the Senate from California, acting in behalf of certain persons in that State, sought from the Russian Government a license or franchise to gather furs in a portion of its American possessions. The charter of the Russian American Company was about to expire. This company had already underlet to the Hudson's Bay Company all its franchise on the main-land between 54° 40' and Cape Spencer; and now it was proposed that an American company, holding directly from the Russian Government, should be substituted for the latter. The mighty Hudson's Bay Company, with headquarters in London,

was to give way to an American company, with headquarters in California. Among letters on this subject addressed to Mr. Cole, and now before me, is one dated San Francisco, April 10, 1866, in which the scheme is developed:—

“There is at the present time a good chance to organize a fur-trading company, to trade between the United States and the Russian possessions in America; and as the charter formerly granted to the Hudson’s Bay Company has expired, this would be the opportune moment to start in. . . . I should think that by a little management this charter could be obtained from the Russian Government for ourselves, as I do not think they are very willing to renew the charter of the Hudson’s Bay Company, and I think they would give the preference to an American company, especially if the company should pay to the Russian Government five per cent. on the gross proceeds of their transactions, and also aid in civilizing and ameliorating the condition of the Indians by employing missionaries, if required by the Russian Government. For the faithful performance of the above we ask a charter for the term of twenty-five years, to be renewed for the same length of time, if the Russian Government finds the company deserving,—the charter to invest us with the right of trading in all the country between the British American line and the Russian Archipelago. . . . Remember, we wish for the same charter as was formerly granted to the Hudson’s Bay Company, and we offer in return more than they did.”

Another correspondent of Mr. Cole, under date of San Francisco, September 17, 1866, wrote:—

“I have talked with a man who has been on the coast and in the trade for ten years past, and he says it is much more valuable than I have supposed, and I think it very important to obtain it, if possible.”

The Russian minister at Washington, whom Mr. Cole saw repeatedly upon the subject, was not authorized to act, and the latter, after conference with the Department of State, was induced to address Mr. Clay, minister of the United States at St. Petersburg, who laid the application before the Russian Government. This was an important step. A letter from Mr. Clay, dated at St. Petersburg as late as February 1, 1867, makes the following revelation.

“The Russian Government has already ceded away its rights in Russian America for a term of years, and the Russo-American Company has also ceded the same to the Hudson’s Bay Company. This lease expires in June next, and the president of the Russo-American Company tells me that they have been in correspondence with the Hudson’s Bay Company about a renewal of the lease for another term of twenty-five or thirty years. Until he receives a definite answer, he cannot enter into negotiations with us or your California company. My opinion is, that, if he can get off with the Hudson’s Bay Company, he will do so, when we can make some arrangements with the Russo-American Company.”

Some time had elapsed since the original attempt of Mr. Gwin, also a Senator from California, and it is probable that the Russian Government had obtained information which enabled it to see its way more clearly. It will be remembered that Prince Gortchakoff had promised an inquiry, and it is known that in 1861 Captain-Lieutenant Golowin, of the Russian navy, made a detailed report on these possessions. Mr. Cole had the advantage of his predecessor. There is reason to believe, also, that the administration of the fur company had not been entirely satisfactory, so that there

were well-founded hesitations with regard to the renewal of its franchise. Meanwhile, in October, 1866, Mr. de Stoeckl, who had long been the Russian minister at Washington, and enjoyed in a high degree the confidence of our Government, returned home on leave of absence, promising his best exertions to promote good relations between the two countries. While he was at St. Petersburg, the applications from the United States were under consideration; but the Russian Government was disinclined to any minor arrangement of the character proposed. Obviously something like a crisis was at hand with regard to these possessions. The existing government was not adequate. The franchises granted there were about to terminate. Something must be done. As Mr. de Stoeckl was leaving for his post, in February, the Archduke Constantine, brother and chief adviser of the Emperor, handed him a map with the lines in our treaty marked upon it, and told him he might treat for cession with those boundaries. The minister arrived in Washington early in March. A negotiation was opened at once. Final instructions were received by the Atlantic cable, from St. Petersburg, on the 29th of March, and at four o'clock on the morning of the 30th of March this important treaty was signed by Mr. Seward on the part of the United States and by Mr. de Stoeckl on the part of Russia.

Few treaties have been conceived, initiated, prosecuted, and completed in so simple a manner, without protocol or despatch. The whole negotiation is seen in its result, unless we except two brief notes, which constitute all that passed between the negotiators. These have an interest general and special, and I conclude the history of this transaction by reading them.

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, March 23, 1867.

"SIR, — With reference to the proposed convention between our respective Governments for a cession by Russia of her American territory to the United States, I have the honor to acquaint you that I must insist upon that clause in the sixth article of the draft which declares the cession to be free and unincumbered by any reservations, privileges, franchises, grants, or possessions by any associated companies, whether corporate or incorporate, Russian or any other, &c., and must regard it as an ultimatum. With the President's approval, however, I will add \$ 200,000 to the consideration money on that account.

"I avail myself of this occasion to offer to you a renewed assurance of my most distinguished consideration.

"WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

"MR. EDWARD DE STOECKL, &c., &c., &c."

[TRANSLATION.]

"WASHINGTON, March 17 [29], 1867.

"MR. SECRETARY OF STATE, — I have the honor to inform you, that, by a telegram, dated 16th [28th] of this month, from St. Petersburg, Prince Gortchakoff informs me that his Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias gives his consent to the cession of the Russian possessions on the American continent to the United States, for the stipulated sum of \$7,200,000 in gold, and that his Majesty the Emperor invests me with full powers to negotiate and sign the treaty.

"Please accept, Mr. Secretary of State, the assurance of my very high consideration.

"STOECKL.

"TO HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD,

"*Secretary of State of the United States.*"

THE TREATY.

THE treaty begins with the declaration, that "the United States of America and his Majesty the Em-

peror of all the Russias, being desirous of strengthening, if possible, the good understanding which exists between them," have appointed plenipotentiaries, who have proceeded to sign articles, wherein it is stipulated on behalf of Russia that "his Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias agrees to cede to the United States by this convention, immediately upon the exchange of the ratifications thereof, all the territory and dominion now possessed by his said Majesty on the continent of America and in the adjacent islands, the same being contained within the geographical limits herein set forth"; and it is stipulated on behalf of the United States, that, "in consideration of the cession aforesaid, the United States agree to pay at the Treasury in Washington, within ten months after the exchange of the ratifications of this convention, to the diplomatic representative or other agent of his Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias duly authorized to receive the same, \$7,200,000 in gold." The ratifications are to be exchanged within three months from the date of the treaty, or sooner, if possible.¹

Beyond the consideration founded on the desire of "strengthening the good understanding" between the two countries, there is the pecuniary consideration already mentioned, which underwent a change in the progress of the negotiation. The sum of seven millions was originally agreed upon; but when it appeared that there was a fur company and also an ice company enjoying monopolies under the existing government, it was thought best that these should be extinguished, in consideration of which our Government added two hundred thousand to the purchase-money, and the Russian

¹ United States Statutes at Large, Vol. XV. pp. 539-543.

Government in formal terms declared "the cession of territory and dominion to be free and unincumbered by any reservations, privileges, franchises, grants, or possessions, by any associated companies, whether corporate or incorporate, Russian or any other, or by any parties, except merely private individual property-holders." Thus the United States receive the cession free of all incumbrances, so far at least as Russia is in a condition to make it. The treaty proceeds to say: "The cession hereby made conveys all the rights, franchises, and privileges now belonging to Russia in the said territory or dominion and appurtenances thereto."¹ In other words, Russia conveys all she has to convey.

QUESTIONS ARISING UNDER THE TREATY.

THERE are questions, not unworthy of attention, which arise under the treaty between Russia and Great Britain, fixing the eastern limits of these possessions, and conceding certain privileges to the latter power. By this treaty, signed at St. Petersburg, 28th February, 1825, after fixing the boundaries between the Russian and British possessions, it is provided that "for the space of *ten years* from the signature of the present convention, the vessels of the two powers, or those belonging to their respective subjects, shall mutually be at liberty to frequent, without any hindrance whatever, all the inland seas, the gulfs, havens, and creeks on the coast, for the purposes of fishing and of trading with the natives"; and also that "the port of Sitka, or Novo Archangelsk, shall be open to the commerce and vessels of British subjects for the space of *ten years* from

¹ Article VI.

the date of the exchange of the ratifications of the present convention.”¹ In the same treaty it is also provided that “the subjects of his Britannic Majesty, from whatever quarter they may arrive, whether from the ocean or from the interior of the continent, shall *forever* enjoy the right of navigating freely and without any hindrance whatever all the rivers and streams which in their course towards the Pacific Ocean may cross the line of demarcation.”² Afterwards a treaty of commerce and navigation between Russia and Great Britain was signed at St. Petersburg, 11th January, 1843, subject to be terminated on notice from either party at the expiration of ten years, in which it is provided, that, “in regard to commerce and navigation in the Russian possessions on the northwest coast of America, the convention concluded at St. Petersburg on the 16th February, 1825, continues in force.”³ Then ensued the Crimean War between Russia and Great Britain, effacing or suspending treaties. Afterwards another treaty of commerce and navigation was signed at St. Petersburg, 12th January, 1859, subject to be terminated on notice from either party at the expiration of ten years, which repeats the last provision.⁴

Thus we have three different stipulations on the part of Russia: one opening seas, gulfs, and havens on the Russian coast to British subjects for fishing and trading with the natives; the second making Sitka a free port to British subjects; and the third making British rivers which flow through the Russian possessions forever free to British navigation. Do the United States succeed to these stipulations?

¹ Articles VII., VIII. : Hertslet's Commercial Treaties, Vol. III. p. 365.

² Art. VI. : Ibid.

³ Art. XII. : Ibid., Vol. VI. p. 767.

⁴ Ibid., Vol. X. p. 1063.

Among these I make a distinction in favor of the last, which by its language is declared to be "forever," and may have been in the nature of an equivalent at the settlement of boundaries between the two powers. But whatever its terms or its origin, it is obvious that it is nothing but a declaration of public law, as always expounded by the United States, and now recognized on the continent of Europe. While pleading with Great Britain, in 1826, for the free navigation of the St. Lawrence, Mr. Clay, then Secretary of State, said that "the American Government did not mean to contend for any principle the benefit of which in analogous circumstances it would deny to Great Britain."¹ During the same year, Mr. Gallatin, our minister in London, when negotiating with Great Britain for the adjustment of boundaries on the Pacific, proposed, that, "if the line should cross any of the branches of the Columbia at points from which they are navigable by boats to the main stream, the navigation of such branches and of the main stream should be perpetually free and common to the people of both nations."² At an earlier day the United States made the same claim with regard to the Mississippi, and asserted, as a general principle, that, "if the right of the upper inhabitants to descend the stream was in any case obstructed, it was an act of force by a stronger society against a weaker, condemned by the judgment of mankind."³ By these admissions our country is estopped, even if the public law of the European continent, first declared at Vienna with regard

¹ Wheaton's *Elements of International Law*, ed. Lawrence, (Boston, 1863,) Part II. ch. 4, § 19, p. 359.

² Greenhow, *History of Oregon and California*, p. 346. *Executive Documents*, 20th Cong. 1st Sess., H. of R., No. 199, pp. 23, 44.

³ Wheaton, Part II. ch. 4, § 18, p. 353.

to the Rhine, did not offer an example which we cannot afford to reject. I rejoice to believe that on this occasion we apply to Great Britain the generous rule which from the beginning we have claimed for ourselves.

The two other stipulations are different in character. They are not declared to be "forever," and do not stand on any principle of public law. Even if subsisting now, they cannot be onerous. I doubt much if they are subsisting now. In succeeding to the Russian possessions, it does not follow that the United States succeed to ancient obligations assumed by Russia, as if, according to a phrase of the Common Law, they were "covenants running with the land." If these stipulations are in the nature of *servitudes*, they depend for their duration on the sovereignty of Russia, and are *personal* or *national* rather than *territorial*. So, at least, I am inclined to believe. But it is hardly profitable to speculate on a point of so little practical value. Even if "running with the land," these servitudes can be terminated at the expiration of ten years from the last treaty by notice, which equitably the United States may give, so as to take effect on the 12th of January, 1869. Meanwhile, during this brief period, it will be easy by Act of Congress in advance to limit importations at Sitka, so that this "free port" shall not be made the channel or doorway by which British goods are introduced into the United States free of duty.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON THE TREATY.

FROM this survey of the treaty, as seen in its origin and the questions under it, I might pass at once to a survey of the possessions which have been conveyed;

but there are other matters of a more general character which present themselves at this stage and challenge judgment. These concern nothing less than the unity, power, and grandeur of the Republic, with the extension of its dominion and its institutions. Such considerations, where not entirely inapplicable, are apt to be controlling. I do not doubt that they will in a great measure determine the fate of this treaty with the American people. They are patent, and do not depend on research or statistics. To state them is enough.

1. *Advantages to the Pacific Coast.*—Foremost in order, if not in importance, I put the desires of our fellow-citizens on the Pacific coast, and the special advantages they will derive from this enlargement of boundary. They were the first to ask for it, and will be the first to profit by it. While others knew the Russian possessions only on the map, they knew them practically in their resources. While others were indifferent, they were planning how to appropriate Russian peltries and fisheries. This is attested by the resolutions of the Legislature of Washington Territory; also by the exertions at different times of two Senators from California, who, differing in political sentiments and in party relations, took the initial steps which ended in this treaty.

These well-known desires were founded, of course, on supposed advantages; and here experience and neighborhood were prompters. Since 1854 the people of California have received their ice from the fresh-water lakes in the island of Kadiak, not far westward from Mount St. Elias. Later still, their fishermen have

searched the waters about the Aleutians and the Shumagins, commencing a promising fishery. Others have proposed to substitute themselves for the Hudson's Bay Company in their franchise on the coast. But all are looking to the Orient, as in the time of Columbus, although like him they sail to the west. To them China and Japan, those ancient realms of fabulous wealth, are the Indies. To draw this commerce to the Pacific coast is no new idea. It haunted the early navigators. Meares, the Englishman, whose voyage in the intervening seas was in 1788, recounts a meeting with Gray, the Boston navigator, whom he found "very sanguine in the superior advantages which his countrymen from New England might reap from this track of trade, and big with many mighty projects."¹ He closes his volumes with an essay entitled "Some Account of the Trade between the Northwest Coast of America and China, &c.," in the course of which² he dwells on the "great and very valuable source of commerce" offered by China as "forming a chain of trade between Hudson's Bay, Canada, and the Northwest Coast"; and then he exhibits on the American side the costly furs of the sea-otter, still so much prized in China,—"mines which are known to lie between the latitudes of 40° and 60° north,"—and also ginseng "in inexhaustible plenty," for which there is still such demand in China, that even Minnesota, at the head-waters of the Mississippi, supplies her contribution. His catalogue might be extended now.

As a practical illustration of this idea, it may be mentioned, that, for a long time, most, if not all, the sea-otter skins of this coast found their way to China.

¹ Voyages from China to the Northwest Coast of America. (London, 1791,) Vol. I. p. 354.

² Ibid., Vol. II. pp. 283-291.

China was the best customer, and therefore Englishmen and Americans followed the Russian Company in carrying these furs to her market, so that Pennant, the English naturalist, impressed by the peculiar advantages of the coast, exclaimed, "What a profitable trade [with China] might not a colony carry on, was it possible to penetrate to these parts of North America by means of the rivers and lakes!"¹ Under the present treaty this coast is ours.

The absence of harbors belonging to the United States on the Pacific limits the outlets of the country. On that whole extent, from Panama to Puget Sound, the only harbor of any considerable value is San Francisco. Further north the harbors are abundant, and they are all nearer to the great marts of Japan and China. But San Francisco itself will be nearer by the way of the Aleutians than by Honolulu. The projection of maps is not always calculated to present an accurate idea of distances. From measurement on a globe it appears that a voyage from San Francisco to Hong Kong by the common way of the Sandwich Islands is 7,140 miles, but by way of the Aleutian Islands it is only 6,060 miles, being a saving of more than one thousand miles, with the enormous additional advantage of being obliged to carry much less coal. Of course a voyage from Sitka, or from Puget Sound, the terminus of the Northern Pacific Railroad, would be shorter still.

The advantages to the Pacific coast have two aspects, — one domestic, and the other foreign. Not only does the treaty extend the coasting trade of California, Oregon, and Washington Territory northward, but it also extends the base of commerce with China and Japan.

¹ *Arctic Zoölogy* (London, 1792), Vol. I. p. 104.

To unite the East of Asia with the West of America is the aspiration of commerce now as when the English navigator recorded his voyage. Of course, whatever helps this result is an advantage. The Pacific Railroad is such an advantage; for, though running westward, it will be, when completed, a new highway to the East. This treaty is another advantage; for nothing can be clearer than that the western coast must exercise an attraction which will be felt in China and Japan just in proportion as it is occupied by a commercial people communicating readily with the Atlantic and with Europe. This cannot be without consequences not less important politically than commercially. Owing so much to the Union, the people there will be bound to it anew, and the national unity will receive another confirmation. Thus the whole country will be a gainer. So are we knit together that the advantages to the Pacific coast will contribute to the general welfare.

2. *Extension of Dominion.* — The extension of dominion is another consideration calculated to captivate the public mind. Few are so cold or philosophical as to regard with insensibility a widening of the bounds of country. Wars have been regarded as successful, when they have given a new territory. The discoverer who had planted the flag of his sovereign on a distant coast has been received as a conqueror. The ingratitude exhibited to Columbus during his later days was compensated by the epitaph, that he had "found a new world for Castile and Leon."¹ His discoveries were

¹ "Por Castilla y por Leon
Nuevo mundo halló Colon."

continued by other navigators; and Spain girdled the earth with her possessions. Portugal, France, Holland, England, each followed the example of Spain, and rejoiced in extended empire.

Territorial acquisitions are among the landmarks of our history. In 1803, Louisiana, embracing the valley of the Mississippi, was acquired from France for fifteen million dollars. In 1819, Florida was acquired from Spain for about three million dollars. In 1845, Texas was annexed without purchase, but subsequently, under the compromises of 1850, an allowance of twelve and three fourth million dollars was made to her. In 1848, California, New Mexico, and Utah were acquired from Mexico after war, and on payment of fifteen million dollars. In 1854,⁶ Arizona was acquired from Mexico for ten million dollars. And now it is proposed to acquire Russian America.

The passion for acquisition, so strong in the individual, is not less strong in the community. A nation seeks an outlying territory, as an individual seeks an outlying farm. The passion shows itself constantly. France, passing into Africa, has annexed Algeria. Spain set her face in the same direction, but without the same success. There are two great powers with which annexion has become a habit. One is Russia, which from the time of Peter has been moving her flag forward in every direction, so that on every side her limits have been extended. Even now the report comes that she is lifting her southern landmarks in Asia, so as to carry her boundary to India. The other annexionist is Great Britain, which from time to time adds another province to her Indian empire. If the United States have from time to time added to their dominion, they have only

yielded to the universal passion, although I do not forget that the late Theodore Parker was accustomed to speak of Anglo-Saxons as among all people remarkable for "greed of land." It was land, not gold, that aroused the Anglo-Saxon phlegm. I doubt, however, if this passion be stronger with us than with others, except, perhaps, that in a community where all participate in government the national sentiments are more active. It is common to the human family. There are few anywhere who could hear of a considerable accession of territory, obtained peacefully and honestly, without a pride of country, even if at certain moments the judgment hesitated. With increased size on the map there is increased consciousness of strength, and the heart of the citizen throbs anew as he traces the extending line.

3. *Extension of Republican Institutions.*—More than the extension of dominion is the extension of republican institutions, which is a traditional aspiration. It was in this spirit that Independence was achieved. In the name of Human Rights our fathers overthrew the kingly power, whose representative was George the Third. They set themselves openly against this form of government. They were against it for themselves, and offered their example to mankind. They were Roman in character, and turned to Roman lessons. With cynical austerity the early Cato said that kings were "carnivorous animals," and probably at his instance it was decreed by the Roman Senate that no king should be allowed within the gates of the city. A kindred sentiment, with less austerity of form, has been received from our fathers; but our city can be nothing less than the

North American continent, with its gates on all the surrounding seas.

John Adams, in the preface to his *Defence of the American Constitutions*, written in London, where he resided at the time as minister, and dated January 1, 1787, at Grosvenor Square, the central seat of aristocratic fashion, after exposing the fabulous origin of the kingly power in contrast with the simple origin of our republican constitutions, thus for a moment lifts the curtain: "Thirteen governments," he says plainly, "thus founded on the natural authority of the people alone, without a pretence of miracle or mystery, and *which are destined to spread over the northern part of that whole quarter of the globe*, are a great point gained in favor of the rights of mankind."¹ Thus, according to the prophetic minister, even at that early day was the destiny of the Republic manifest. It was to spread over the northern part of the American quarter of the globe, and it was to help the rights of mankind.

By the text of our Constitution, the United States are bound to guaranty "a republican form of government" to every State in the Union; but this obligation, which is applicable only at home, is an unquestionable indication of the national aspiration everywhere. The Republic is something more than a local policy; it is a general principle, not to be forgotten at any time, especially when the opportunity is presented of bringing an immense region within its influence. Elsewhere it has for the present failed; but on this account our example is more important. Who can forget the generous lament of Lord Byron, whose passion for Freedom was not mitigated by his rank as

¹ Works, Vol. IV. p. 293.

an hereditary legislator of England, when he exclaims, in memorable verse, —

“The name of Commonwealth is past and gone
O’er the three fractions of the groaning globe”?

Who can forget the salutation which the poet sends to the “one great clime,” which, nursed in Freedom, enjoys what he calls the “proud distinction” of not being confounded with other lands, —

“Whose sons must bow them at a monarch’s motion,
As if his senseless sceptre were a wand”?

The present treaty is a visible step in the occupation of the whole North American continent. As such it will be recognized by the world and accepted by the American people. But the treaty involves something more. We dismiss one other monarch from the continent. One by one they have retired, — first France, then Spain, then France again, and now Russia, — all giving way to the absorbing Unity declared in the national motto, *E pluribus unum*.

4. *Anticipation of Great Britain.* — Another motive to this acquisition may be found in the desire to anticipate imagined schemes or necessities of Great Britain. With regard to all these I confess doubt; and yet, if we credit report, it would seem as if there were already a British movement in this direction. Sometimes it is said that Great Britain desires to buy, if Russia will sell. Sir George Simpson, Governor-in-chief of the Hudson’s Bay Company, declared, that, without the strip on the coast underlet to them by the Russian Company, the interior would be “comparatively useless to England.”¹ Here, then, is provoca-

¹ Journey round the World, Vol. I. p. 209.

tion to buy. Sometimes report assumes a graver character. A German scientific journal, in an elaborate paper entitled "The Russian Colonies on the Northwest Coast of America," after referring to the constant "pressure" upon Russia, proceeds to say that there are already crowds of adventurers from British Columbia and California now at the gold mines on the Stikine, which flows from British territory through the Russian possessions, who openly declare their purpose of driving the Russians out of this region. I refer to the "Archiv für Wissenschaftliche Kunde von Russland,"¹ edited at Berlin as late as 1863, by A. Erman, and undoubtedly the leading authority on Russian questions. At the same time it presents a curious passage bearing directly on British policy, purporting to be taken from the "British Colonist," a newspaper of Victoria, on Vancouver's Island. As this was regarded of sufficient importance to be translated into German for the instruction of scientific readers, I am justified in laying it before you, restored from German to English.

"The information which we daily publish from the Stikine River very naturally excites public attention in a high degree. Whether the territory through which the river flows be regarded from a political, commercial, or industrial point of view, it promises within a short time to awaken a still more general interest. Not only will the intervention of the royal jurisdiction be demanded in order to give it a complete form of government, but, if the land proves as rich as there is now reason to believe it to be, it is not improbable that it will result in negotiations between England and Russia for the cession of the sea-coast to the British Crown. It is not to be supposed that a stream like the Stikine, which

¹ Band XXII. pp. 47-70.

is navigable for steamers from one hundred and seventy to one hundred and ninety miles, which waters a territory so rich in gold that it will attract myriads of men, — that the commerce upon such a road can always pass through a Russian gateway of thirty miles from the sea-coast to the interior. The English population which occupies the interior cannot be so easily managed by the Russians as the Stikine Indians of the coast manage the Indians of the interior. Our business must be in British hands. Our resources, our energies, our spirit of enterprise cannot be employed in building up a Russian emporium at the mouth of the Stikine. We must have for our merchandise a depot over which the British flag waves. By the treaty of 1825 the navigation of the river is secured to us. The navigation of the Mississippi was also open to the United States before the Louisiana purchase; but the growing strength of the North made the acquisition of that territory, either by purchase or by force of arms, an inevitable necessity. We look upon the sea-coast of the Stikine region in the same light. The strip of land which stretches along from Portland Canal to Mount St. Elias, with a breadth of thirty miles, and which, according to the treaty of 1825, forms a part of Russian America, *must eventually become the property of Great Britain*, either as the direct result of the gold discoveries, or from causes as yet not fully developed, but whose operation is certain. For can we reasonably suppose that the strip, three hundred miles long and thirty miles wide, which is used by the Russians solely for the collection of furs and walrus-teeth, will forever control the entrance to our immense northern territory? It is a principle of England to acquire territory only for purposes of defence. Canada, Nova Scotia, Malta, the Cape of Good Hope, and the greater part of our Indian possessions were all acquired for purposes of defence. In Africa, India, and China the same rule is followed by the Government to-day. With a power like Russia it would perhaps be more

difficult to arrange matters ; but if we need the sea-coast in order to protect and maintain our commerce with an interior rich in precious metals, then we must have it. The United States needed Florida and Louisiana, and took them. We need the coast of New Norfolk and New Cornwall.

"It is just as much the destiny of our Anglo-Norman race to possess the whole of Russian America, however desolate and inhospitable it may be, as it has been that of the Russian Northmen to possess themselves of Northern Europe and Asia. As the Wandering Jew and his phantom, so will the Anglo-Norman and the Russian yet gaze at each other from the opposite sides of Behring Strait. Between the two races the northern halves of the Old and New World must be divided. America must be ours.

"The recent discovery of the precious metals in our hyperborean Eldorado will most probably hasten the annexation of the territory in question. It can hardly be doubted that the gold region of the Stikine extends away to the western affluents of the Mackenzie. In this case the increase of the business and of the population will exceed our most sanguine expectations. Who shall reap the profit of this? The mouths of rivers, both before and since the time of railroads, have controlled the business of the interior. To our national pride the thought, however, is intolerable, that the Russian griffin should possess a point which is indebted to the British lion for its importance. The mouth of the Stikine must be ours, — or at least a harbor of export must be established on British soil from which our steamers can pass the Russian belt. Fort Simpson, Dundas Island, Portland Canal, or some other convenient point, might be selected for this purpose. The necessity of speedy measures, in order to secure the control of the Stikine, is manifest. If we let slip the opportunity, we shall live to see a Russian city arise at the gates of a British colony."

Thus, if we credit this colonial ejaculation, caught up

and preserved by German science, the Russian possessions were destined to round and complete the domain of Great Britain on this continent. The Russian "griffin" was to give way to the British "lion." The Anglo-Norman was to be master as far as Behring Strait, across which he might survey his Russian neighbor. How this was to be accomplished is not precisely explained. The promises of gold on the Stikine failed, and it is not improbable that this colonial plan was as unsubstantial. Colonists become excited easily. This is not the first time that Russian America has been menaced in a similar way. During the Crimean War there seemed to be in Canada a spirit not unlike that of the Vancouver journalist, unless we are misled by the able pamphlet¹ of Mr. A. K. Roche, of Quebec, where, after describing Russian America as "richer in resources and capabilities than it has hitherto been allowed to be, either by the English, who shamefully gave it up, or by the Russians, who cunningly obtained it," the author urges an expedition for its conquest and annexion. His proposition fell on the happy termination of the war, but it exists as a warning, with notice also of a former English title, "shamefully" abandoned.

This region is distant enough from Great Britain; but there is an incident of past history which shows that distance from the metropolitan government has not excluded the idea of war. Great Britain could hardly be more jealous of Russia on these coasts than was Spain in a former day, if we listen to the report of Humboldt. I refer again to his authoritative work, "*Essai Politique sur la Nouvelle-Espagne*,"² where it is recorded, that, as early as 1788, even while peace was still unbroken, the

¹ Russian America and the Present War.

² Tom. I. p. 345.

Spaniards could not bear the idea of Russians in this region, and when, in 1799, the Emperor Paul declared war on Spain, the hardy project was formed of an expedition from the Mexican ports of Monterey and San Blas against the Russian colonies; on which the philosophic traveller remarks, in words which are recalled by the Vancouver manifesto, that, "if this project had been executed, the world would have witnessed two nations in conflict, which, occupying the opposite extremities of Europe, found themselves neighbors in the other hemisphere on the eastern and western boundaries of their vast empires." Thus, notwithstanding an intervening circuit of half the globe, two great powers were about to encounter each other on these coasts. But I hesitate to believe that the British of our day, in any considerable numbers, have adopted the early Spanish disquietude at the presence of Russia on this continent.

5. *Amity of Russia.* — There is still another consideration concerning this treaty not to be disregarded. It attests and assures the amity of Russia. Even if you doubt the value of these possessions, the treaty is a sign of friendship. It is a new expression of that *entente cordiale* between the two powers which is a phenomenon of history. Though unlike in institutions, they are not unlike in recent experience. Sharers of common glory in a great act of Emancipation, they also share together the opposition or antipathy of other nations. Perhaps this experience has not been without effect in bringing them together. At all events, no coldness or unkindness has interfered at any time with their good relations.

The archives of the State Department show an un-

interrupted cordiality between the two Governments, dating far back in our history. More than once Russia has proffered her good offices between the United States and Great Britain; once also she was a recognized arbitrator. She offered her mediation to terminate the War of 1812; and under her arbitration questions with Great Britain arising under the Treaty of Ghent were amicably settled in 1822. But it was during our recent troubles that we felt more than ever her friendly sentiments, although it is not improbable that the accident of position and of distance had influence in preserving these undisturbed. The Rebellion, which tempted so many other powers into its embrace, could not draw Russia from her habitual good-will. Her solicitude for the Union was early declared. She made no unjustifiable concession of *ocean belligerence*, with all its immunities and powers, to Rebels in arms against the Union. She furnished no hospitality to Rebel cruisers, nor was any Rebel agent ever received, entertained, or encouraged at St. Petersburg, — while, on the other hand, there was an understanding that the United States should be at liberty to carry prizes into Russian ports. So natural and easy were the relations between the two Governments, that such complaints as incidentally arose on either side were amicably adjusted by verbal explanations without written controversy.

Positive acts occurred to strengthen these relations. As early as 1861, the two Governments agreed to act together for the establishment of a connection between San Francisco and St. Petersburg by an inter-oceanic telegraph across Behring Strait; and this agreement was subsequently sanctioned by Congress.¹ Meanwhile

¹ Act of July 1, 1864 : Statutes at Large, Vol. XIII. pp. 340, 341.

occurred the visit of the Russian fleet in the winter of 1863, intended by the Emperor, and accepted by the United States, as a friendly demonstration. This was followed by a communication of the Secretary of State, dated 26th December, 1864, inviting the Archduke Constantine to visit the United States, where it was suggested that such a visit "would be beneficial to us and by no means unprofitable to Russia," but "forbearing to specify reasons," and assuring him, that, coming as a national guest, he "would receive a cordial and most demonstrative welcome."¹ Affairs in Russia prevented the acceptance of this invitation. Afterwards, in the spring of 1866, Congress by solemn resolution declared the sympathies of the United States with the Emperor on his escape from the madness of an assassin,² and Mr. Fox, at the time Assistant Secretary of the Navy, was appointed to take the resolution of Congress to the Emperor, and, in discharge of this trust, to declare the friendly sentiments of our country for Russia. He was conveyed to Cronstadt in the monitor *Miantonomoh*, the most formidable ship of our navy, and thus this agent of war became a messenger of peace. The monitor and the minister were received in Russia with unbounded hospitality.

In relations such as I have described, the cession of territory seems a natural transaction, entirely in harmony with the past. It remains to hope that it may be a new link in an amity which, without effort, has overcome differences of institutions and intervening space on the globe.

¹ Diplomatic Correspondence, 1865-66: Executive Documents, 39th Cong. 1st Sess., H. of R., No. 1, p. 366.

² Joint Resolution, May 16, 1866: Statutes at Large, Vol. XIV. p. 355.

SHALL THE TREATY BE RATIFIED ?

SUCH are obvious considerations of a general character. The interests of the Pacific States, the extension of the national domain, the extension of republican institutions, the foreclosure of adverse British possession, and the amity of Russia,—these are the points we have passed in review. Most of these, if not all, are calculated to impress the public mind; but I can readily understand a difference of opinion with regard to the urgency of negotiation at this hour. Some may think that the purchase-money and the annual outlay that must follow might have been postponed another decade, while Russia continued in possession as trustee for our benefit; and yet some of the reasons for the treaty do not seem to allow delay.

At all events, now that the treaty has been signed by plenipotentiaries on each side duly empowered, it is difficult to see how we can refuse to complete the purchase without putting to hazard the friendly relations which happily subsist between the United States and Russia. The overtures originally proceeded from us. After a delay of years, and other intervening propositions, the bargain was at length concluded. It is with nations as with individuals. A bargain once made must be kept. Even if still open to consideration, it must not be lightly abandoned. I am satisfied that the dishonoring of this treaty, after what has passed, would be a serious responsibility for our country. As an international question, it would be tried by the public opinion of the world; and there are many who, not appreciating the requirement of our Constitution by which a treaty must have "the advice and consent of

the Senate," would regard its rejection as bad faith. There would be jeers at us, and jeers at Russia also: at us for levity in making overtures, and at Russia for levity in yielding to them. Had the Senate been consulted in advance, before the treaty was signed or either power publicly committed, as is often done on important occasions, it would be under less constraint. On such a consultation there would have been opportunity for all possible objections, and a large latitude for reasonable discretion. Let me add, that, while forbearing objection now, I hope that this treaty may not be drawn into a precedent, at least in the independent manner of its negotiation. I would save to the Senate an important power justly belonging to it.

A CAVEAT.

THERE is one other point on which I file my *caveat*. This treaty must not be a precedent for a system of indiscriminate and costly annexion. Sincerely believing that republican institutions under the primacy of the United States must embrace this whole continent, I cannot adopt the sentiment of Jefferson, who, while confessing satisfaction in settlements on the Pacific coast, saw there in the future nothing but "free and independent Americans," bound to the United States only by "ties of blood and interest," without political unity,¹—or of Webster, who in the same spirit said of settlers there, "They will raise a standard for themselves, and they ought to do it."² Nor am I willing

¹ Letters to John Jacob Astor, May 24, 1812, and November 9, 1813: Writings, Vol. VI. pp. 55, 248. See also Letter to Mr. Breckenridge, August 12, 1803: *Ibid.*, Vol. IV. pp. 498-501.

² Speech at Faneuil Hall, November 7, 1845: Boston Daily Advertiser, November 10th.

to restrict myself to the principle so tersely expressed by Andrew Jackson, in his letter to President Monroe: "Concentrate our population, confine our frontier to proper limits, until our country, to those limits, is filled with a dense population."¹ But I cannot disguise my anxiety that every stage in our predestined future shall be by natural processes, without war, and I would add even without purchase. There is no territorial aggrandizement worth the price of blood. Only under peculiar circumstances can it become the subject of pecuniary contract. Our triumph should be by growth and organic expansion in obedience to "pre-established harmony," recognizing always the will of those who are to become our fellow-citizens. All this must be easy, if we are only true to ourselves. Our motto may be that of Goethe: "Without haste, without rest." Let the Republic be assured in tranquil liberty, with all equal before the law, and it will conquer by its sublime example. More happy than Austria, who acquired possessions by marriage, we shall acquire them by the attraction of republican institutions.

*"Bella gerant alii : tu, felix Austria, nube;
Nam quæ Mars aliis, dat tibi regna Venus."*²

The famous epigram will be just as applicable to us, inasmuch as our acquisitions will be under the sanction of wedlock to the Republic. There may be wedlock of a people as well as of a prince. Meanwhile our first care should be to improve and elevate the Republic, whose sway will be so comprehensive. Plant it with schools; cover it with churches; fill it with

¹ Letter on the Florida Treaty, June 20, 1820 : Parton's *Life of Jackson*, Vol. II. p. 585.

² Attributed to Matthias Corvinus, King of Hungary. See Coxé, *History of the House of Austria*, (London, 1820,) Ch. XXV., Vol. II. p. 89.

libraries ; make it abundant with comfort, so that poverty shall disappear ; keep it constant in the assertion of Human Rights. And here we may fitly recall those words of Antiquity, which Cicero quoted from the Greek, and Webster in our day quoted from Cicero : " You have a Sparta ; adorn it." ¹

SOURCES OF INFORMATION UPON RUSSIAN AMERICA.

I AM now brought to consider the character of these possessions and their probable value. Here I am obliged to confess a dearth of authentic information easily accessible. Few among us read Russian, so that works in this language are locked up from us. One of these, in two large and showy volumes, is now before me, entitled "An Historical Survey of the Formation of the Russian-American Company, and its Progress to the Present Time, by P. Teshmeneff, St. Petersburg." The first volume appeared in 1860, and the second in 1863. Here, among other things, is a tempting engraving of Sitka, wrapt in mists, with the sea before and the snow-capped mountains darkened with forest behind. Judging from the table of contents, which has been translated for me by a Russian, the book ought to be instructive. There is also another Russian work of an official character, which appeared in 1861 at St. Petersburg, in the "Morskoi Sbornik," or Naval Review, and is entitled "Materials for the History of the Russian Colonies on the Coasts of the Pacific." The report of Captain-Lieutenant Golowin, made to the Grand Duke Constantine in 1861, with which we have become acquainted through a scientific

¹ Cicero, Epist. ad Atticum, IV. 6.

German journal, appeared originally in the same review. These are recent productions. After the early voyages of Behring, first ordered by Peter and supervised by the Imperial Academy, the spirit of geographical research seems to have subsided at St. Petersburg. Other enterprises absorbed attention. And yet I would not do injustice to the voyages of Billings, recounted by Sauer, or of Lisiansky, or of Kotzebue, all under the auspices of Russia, the last of which may compare with any as a contribution to science. I may add Lütke also; but Kotzebue was a worthy successor to Behring and Cook.

Beside these official contributions, most of them by no means fresh, are materials derived from casual navigators, who, scudding these seas, rested in the harbors as the water-fowl on its flight,—from whalers, who were there merely as Nimrods of the ocean, or from adventurers in quest of the rich furs it furnished. There are also the gazetteers and geographies; but they are less instructive on this head than usual, being founded on information now many years old.

Perhaps no region of equal extent on the globe, unless we except the interior of Africa or possibly Greenland, is so little known. Here I do not speak for myself alone. A learned German, whom I have already quoted, after saying that the explorations have been limited to the coast, testifies that “the interior, not only of the continent, but even of the island of Sitka, is to this day unexplored, and is in every respect *terra incognita*.”¹ The same has been repeated of the other islands. Admiral Lütke, whose circumnavigation

¹ Erman, Die Russischen Colonien an der Nordwestküste von Amerika: Archiv, Band XXII. p. 48.

of the globe began in 1826, and whose work bears date 1835-36, says of the Aleutian Archipelago, that, although frequented for more than a century by Russian vessels and those of other nations, it is to-day almost as little known as in the time of Cook. Another writer of authority, the compiler of the official work on the People of Russia, published as late as 1862, speaks of the interior as "a mystery." And yet another says that our ignorance with regard to this region would make it a proper scene for a chapter of Gulliver's Travels.

Where so little was known, invention found scope. Imagination was made to supply the place of knowledge, and poetry pictured the savage desolation in much admired verse. Campbell, in the "Pleasures of Hope," while exploring "Earth's loneliest bounds and Ocean's wildest shore," reaches this region, which he portrays:—

"Lo! to the wintry winds the pilot yields
His bark careering o'er unfathomed fields.

Now far he sweeps, where scarce a summer smiles,
On Behring's rocks or Greenland's naked isles;
Cold on his midnight watch the breezes blow
From wastes that slumber in eternal snow,
And waft across the waves' tumultuous roar
The wolf's long howl from Oonalaska's shore."

All of which, so far at least as it describes this region, is inconsistent with truth. The poet ignores the isothermal line, which plays such a conspicuous part on the Pacific coast. Here the evidence is positive. Portlock, the navigator, who was there toward the close of the last century, after describing Cook's Inlet, which is several degrees north of Oonalaska, records his belief "that the climate here is not so severe as has been generally supposed; for, in the course of our traffic with the natives, they frequently brought berries of several

sorts, and in particular blackberries, equally fine with those met with in England.”¹ Kotzebue, who was here later, says that he found “the weather pretty warm at Oonalaska.”² South of the Aleutians the climate is warmer still. The poet ignores natural history also, as regards the distribution of animals. Curiously enough, it does not appear that “wolves” exist on any of the Fox Islands. Coxe, in his work on Russian Discoveries,³ records that “reindeer, bears, *wolves*, ice-foxes, are not to be found on these islands.” But he was never there. Meares, who was in those seas, says, “*The only animals* on these islands are foxes, some of which are black.”⁴ Cook, who visited Oonalaska twice, and once made a prolonged stay, expressly says, “Foxes and weasels were *the only quadrupeds* we saw; but they told us that they had hares also, and marmottas.”⁵ But quadrupeds like these hardly sustain the exciting picture. The same experienced navigator furnishes a glimpse of the inhabitants, as they appeared to him, which would make us tremble, if the “wolves” of the poet were numerous. He says, “To all appearance, they are the most peaceable, inoffensive people I ever met with”; and Cook had been at Otaheite. “No such thing as an offensive or even defensive weapon was seen amongst the natives of Oonalaska.”⁶ Then, at least, the inhabitants did not share the ferocity of the “wolves” and of the climate. Another navigator fascinates us by a description of the boats, which struck him “with amazement beyond expression”; and he explains: “If perfect symmetry, smoothness, and proportion constitute beauty, they are beautiful; to me they

¹ Voyage, p. 118.

² Voyage, Vol. I. p. 275.

³ Part I. ch. 11, p. 148.

⁴ Voyages, Vol. I. p. xvi.

⁵ Voyage, Vol. II. p. 518.

⁶ Ibid., pp. 509, 515.

appeared so beyond anything that I ever beheld. I have seen some of them as transparent as oiled paper.”¹ But these are the very boats that buffet “the waves’ tumultuous roar,” while “the breezes” waft “the wolf’s long howl.” The same reporter introduces another feature. According to him, the sojourning Russians “seem to have no desire to leave this place, where they enjoy that indolence so pleasing to their minds.”² The lotus-eaters of Homer were no better off. The picture is completed by another touch from Lütke. Admitting the want of trees, the Admiral suggests that their place is supplied not only by luxuriant grass, but by wood thrown upon the coast, including trunks of camphor from Chinese and Japanese waters, and “a tree which gives forth the odor of the rose.”³ Such is a small portion of the testimony, most of it in print before the poet sang.⁴

Nothing has been written about this region, whether the coast or the islands, more authentic or interesting than the narrative of Captain Cook on his third and last voyage. He saw with intelligence, and his editor has imparted to the description a clearness almost elegant. The record of Captain Portlock’s voyage from London to the Northwest Coast, in 1785–8, seems honest, and is instructive. Captain Meares, whose voyage was contemporaneous, saw and exposed the importance of trade between the Northwest Coast and China. Vancouver, who came a little later, has described some

¹ Billings’s Expedition, p. 157.

² Ibid., p. 161.

³ Voyage, Tom. I. p. 232.

⁴ Captain D’Wolf, whose little book was not printed till 1861, says there was “little or no game but foxes,” and he adds that in fact he “was the only Wolf ever known upon the island.” — *Voyage to the North Pacific*, pp. 69, 70.

parts of the coast. La Pérouse, the unfortunate French navigator, has afforded another picture of it, painted with French colors. Before him was Maurelle, an officer in the Spanish expedition of 1779, a portion of whose journal is preserved in the Introduction to the volumes of La Pérouse. After him was Marchand, who, during a circumnavigation of the globe, stopped here in 1791. The Voyage of the latter, published in three quartos, is accompanied by an Historical Introduction, which is a mine of information on all the voyages to this coast. Then came the successive Russian voyages already mentioned, and in 1804-6 the "Voyage to the North Pacific" of Captain John D'Wolf, one of our own enterprising countrymen. Later came the "Voyage round the World" by Captain Sir Edward Belcher, with a familiar sketch of life at Sitka, where he stopped in 1837, and an engraving of the arsenal and light-house there. Then followed the "Overland Journey round the World," in 1841-2, by Sir George Simpson, Governor-in-chief of the Hudson's Bay Company, with an account of a visit to Sitka and the hospitality of its governor. To these I add the "Nautical Magazine" for 1849, Volume XVIII., which contains some excellent pages about Sitka; the "Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London" for 1841, Volume XI., and for 1852, Volume XXII., where this region is treated under the heads of "Observations on the Indigenous Tribes of the Northwest Coast of America," and "Notes on the Distribution of Animals available as Food in the Arctic Regions"; Burney's "Northeastern Voyages"; the magnificent work entitled "Description Ethnographique des Peuples de la Russie," which appeared at St. Petersburg in 1862, on the tenth cen-

ennial anniversary of the foundation of the Russian Empire; the very recent work of Murray on the "Geographical Distribution of Mammals"; the work of Sir John Richardson, "Fauna Boreali-Americana"; Latham on "The Nationalities of Europe," in the chapters on the population of Russian America; the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and the admirable "Physical Atlas" of Alexander Keith Johnston. I mention also an elaborate article by Holmberg, in the Transactions of the Finland Society of Sciences at Helsingfors, replete with information on the Ethnography of the Northwest Coast.¹

Doubtless the most precise and valuable information has been contributed by Germany. The Germans are the best of geographers; besides, many Russian contributions are in German. Müller, who recorded the discoveries of Behring, was a German. Nothing more important on this subject has ever appeared than the German work of the Russian Admiral Von Wrangell, "Statistische und Ethnographische Nachrichten über die Russischen Besitzungen an der Nordwestküste von Amerika," first published by Baer in his "Beiträge zur Kenntniss des Russischen Reiches," in 1839. There is also the "Verhandlungen der Russisch-Kaiserlichen Mineralogischen Gesellschaft zu St. Petersburg," 1848 and 1849, which contains an elaborate article, in itself a volume, on the Orography and Geology of the Northwest Coast and the adjoining islands, at the end of which is a bibliographical list of works and materials illustrating the discovery and history of the western

¹ Ethnographische Skizzen über die Völker des Russischen Amerika, von H. J. Holmberg: Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicæ, 1856, Tom. IV. Fasc. 2, pp. 281, seqq.

half of North America and the neighboring seas. I also refer generally to the "Archiv für Wissenschaftliche Kunde von Russland," edited by Erman, but especially the volume for 1863, containing the abstract of Golowin's report on the Russian Colonies in North America, as it appeared originally in the "Morskoï Sbornik." Besides these, there are Wappäus, "Handbuch der Geographie und Statistik von Nord-Amerika," published at Leipsic in 1855; Petermann, in his "Mittheilungen über wichtige neue Erforschungen auf dem Gesamtgebiete der Geographie," for 1856, p. 486, for 1859, p. 41, and for 1863, pp. 70, 237, 277; Kittlitz, "Denkwürdigkeiten einer Reise nach dem Russischen Amerika, nach Mikronesien und durch Kamtschatka," published at Gotha in 1858; also, by the same author, "The Vegetation of the Coasts and Islands of the Pacific," translated from the German, and published at London in 1861.

Much recent information has been derived from the great companies possessing the monopoly of trade. Latterly there has been an unexpected purveyor in the Russian American Telegraph Company, under the direction of Captain Charles S. Bulkley; and here our own countrymen help us. To this expedition we are indebted for authentic evidence with regard to the character of the region, and the great rivers which traverse it. The Smithsonian Institution and the Chicago Academy of Sciences coöperated with the Telegraph Company in the investigation of the natural history. Major Kennicott, a young naturalist, originally in the service of the Institution, and Director of the Museum of the Chicago Academy, was the enterprising chief of the Yukon division of the expedition. While in the midst of his valuable labors, he died suddenly, in the month of

May last, at Nulato, on the banks of the great river, the Kwichpak, which may be called the Mississippi of the North, far away in the interior, and on the confines of the Arctic Circle, where the sun was visible all night. Even after death he was still an explorer. From this remote outpost, his remains, after descending the unknown river in an Esquimaux boat of seal-skins, steered by the faithful companion of his labors, were transported by way of Panama to his home at Chicago, where he now lies buried. Such an incident cannot be forgotten, and his name will always remind us of courageous enterprise, before which distance and difficulty disappeared. He was not a beginner, when he entered into the service of the Telegraph Company. Already he had visited the Yukon country by the way of the Mackenzie River, and contributed to the Smithsonian Institution important information with regard to its geography and natural history, some of which is found in their Reports. Nature in novel forms was open to him. The birds here maintained their kingdom. All about him was the mysterious breeding-place of the canvas-back duck, whose eggs, never before seen by naturalist, covered acres.

If we look to maps for information, here again we are disappointed. Latterly the coast is outlined and described with reasonable completeness; so also are the islands. This is the contribution of navigators and of recent Russian charts. But the interior is little more than a blank, calling to mind "the uninhabitable downs," where, according to Swift, the old geographers "place elephants for want of towns." I have already referred to what purports to be a "General Map of the Russian Empire," published by the Academy of Sciences at St.

Petersburg in 1776, and republished at London in 1780, where Russian America does not appear. I might mention also that Captain Cook complained in his day of the Russian maps as "singularly erroneous." On the return of the expedition, English maps recorded his explorations and the names he assigned to different parts of the coast. These were reproduced in St. Petersburg, and the Russian copy was then reproduced in London, so that geographical knowledge was very little advanced. Some of the best maps of this region are by Germans, who excel in maps. I mention an excellent one of the Aleutian Islands and the neighboring coasts, especially to illustrate their orography and geology, which will be found at the end of the volume of Transactions of the Imperial Mineralogical Society at St. Petersburg to which I have already referred.

Late maps attest the tardiness of information. Here, for instance, is an excellent map of North America, purporting to be published by the Geographical Institute of Weimar as late as 1859, on which we have the Yukon pictured, very much like the Niger in Africa, as a large river meandering in the interior with no outlet to the sea. Here also is a Russian map of this very region, as late as 1861, where the course of the Yukon is left in doubt. On other maps, as in the Physical Atlas of Keith Johnston, it is presented, under another name, entering into the Frozen Ocean. But the secret is penetrated at last. Recent discovery, by the enterprise of our citizens in the service of the Telegraph Company, fixes that this river is an affluent of the Kwichpak, as the Missouri is an affluent of the Mississippi, and enters into Behring Sea by many mouths, between the parallels of 62° and 63°. After the death

of Major Kennicott, a division of his party, with nothing but a skin boat, ascended the river to Fort Yukon, where it bifurcates, and descended it again to Nulato, thus establishing the entire course from its sources in the Rocky Mountains for a distance exceeding a thousand miles. I have before me now an outline map just prepared by our Coast Survey, where this correction is made. But this is only a harbinger of the maturer labors of our accomplished bureau, when the coasts of this region are under the jurisdiction of the United States.

In closing this abstract of authorities, being the chief sources of original information, I cannot forbear expressing my satisfaction, that, with the exception of a single work, all these are found in the Congressional Library, now so happily enriched by the rare collection of the Smithsonian Institution. Sometimes individuals are like libraries; and this seems to be illustrated in the case of Professor Baird, of the Smithsonian Institution, who is thoroughly informed on all questions connected with the natural history of Russian America, and also of George Gibbs, Esq., now of Washington, who is the depository of valuable knowledge, the result of his own personal studies and observations, with regard to the native races.

CHARACTER AND VALUE OF RUSSIAN AMERICA.

I PASS now to a consideration of the character and value of these possessions, as seen under these different heads: first, Government; secondly, Population; thirdly, Climate; fourthly, Vegetable Products; fifthly, Mineral Products; sixthly, Furs; and, seventhly, Fish-

eries. Of these I shall speak briefly in their order. There are certain words of a general character, which I introduce by way of preface. I quote from Blodget on the "Climatology of the United States and of the Temperate Latitudes of the North American Continent."

"It is most surprising that so little is known of the great islands and the long line of coast from Puget's Sound to Sitka, ample as its resources must be even for recruiting the transient commerce of the Pacific, independent of its immense intrinsic value. To the region bordering the Northern Pacific the finest maritime positions belong throughout its entire extent; and no part of the West of Europe exceeds it in the advantages of equable climate, fertile soil, and commercial accessibility of the coast. The western slope of the Rocky Mountain system may be included as a part of this maritime region, embracing an immense area, from the forty-fifth to the sixtieth parallel and five degrees of longitude in width. The cultivable surface of this district cannot be much less than three hundred thousand square miles."¹

From this sketch, which is in the nature of a picture, I pass to the different heads.

1. *Government.* — The Russian settlements were for a long time without any regular government. They were little more than temporary lodgements for purposes of trade, where the will of the stronger prevailed. The natives, who had enslaved each other, became in turn the slaves of these mercenary adventurers. Captain Cook records "the great subjection"² of the natives at Oonalaska, when he was there in 1778; and a Russian navigator, fourteen years later, describes the islands

¹ Blodget, *Climatology*, p. 532.

² *Voyage to the Pacific* (London, 1784), Vol. II. p. 509.

generally as "under the sway of roving hunters more savage than any tribes he had hitherto met with."¹ At Oonalaska the Russians for a long time employed all the men in the chase, "taking the fruits of their labor to themselves."²

The first trace of government which I find was in 1790, at the important island of Kadiak, or the Great Island, as it was called, where a Russian company was established under direction of a Greek by the name of Delareff, who, according to the partial report of a Russian navigator, "governed with the strictest justice, as well natives as Russians, and established a school, where the young natives were taught the Russian language, reading and writing."³ Here were about fifty Russians, including officers of the company, and another person described as "there on the part of Government to collect tribute."⁴ The establishment consisted of five houses after the Russian fashion,—barracks laid out on either side, somewhat like the boxes at a coffee-house, with different offices, represented as follows: "An office of appeal, to settle disputes, levy fines, and punish offenders by a regular trial; here Delareff presides, and I believe that few courts of justice pass a sentence with more impartiality; an office of receipt and delivery, both for the company and for tribute; the commissaries' department, for the distribution of the regulated portions of provision; counting-house, &c.: all in this building, at one end of which is Delareff's habitation."⁵ If this picture is not overdrawn,—and it surely is,—affairs here did not improve with time. But D'Wolf,

¹ Billings's Expedition, p. 274.

² Ibid., Appendix, p. 55.

³ Ibid., p. 171.

⁴ Ibid., p. 172.

⁵ Ibid., p. 173.

who was there in 1805 – 6, reports “about forty houses of various descriptions, including a church, school-house, store-house, and barracks”; and he adds: “The school-house was quite a respectable establishment, well filled with pupils.”¹

There were various small companies, of which that at Kadiak was the most considerable, all finally fused into one large trading company, known as the Russian American Company, organized in 1799, under a charter from the Emperor Paul, with the power of administration throughout the whole region, including coasts and islands. In this respect it was not unlike the East India Company, which has played such a part in English history; but it may be more properly compared to the Hudson’s Bay Company, of which it was a Russian counterpart. The charter was for a term of years, but it has been from time to time extended, and, as I understand, is now about to expire. The powers of the Company are sententiously described by the “*Almanach de Gotha*” for 1867, where, under the head of Russia, it says that “to the present time Russian America has been the property of a company.”

I know no limitation upon the Company, except that latterly it has been bound to appoint its chief functionary, called “Administrator General,” from the higher officers of the imperial navy, when he becomes invested with what are declared the prerogatives of a governor in Siberia. This requirement has doubtless secured the superior order of magistrates since enjoyed. Among these have been Baron Wrangell, an admiral, there at the time of the treaty with Great Britain in 1825; Captain Kuprianoff, who had commanded the *Azof*, a ship

¹ Voyage to the North Pacific, pp. 63, 64.

of the line, in the Black Sea, and spoke English well; Captain Etolin; Admiral Furuhelm, who, after being there five years, was made governor of the province of the Amoor; Admiral Woiwodsky; and Prince Maksutoff, an admiral also, who is the present Administrator General. The term of service is ordinarily five years.

The seat of government is the town of New Archangel, better known by its aboriginal name of Sitka, with a harbor as smooth and safe as a pond. Its present population cannot be far from one thousand, although even this is changeable. In spring, when sailors leave for the sea and trappers for the chase, it has been reduced to as few as one hundred and eighty. It was not without a question that Sitka at last prevailed as the metropolis. Lütke sets forth reasons elaborately urged in favor of St. Paul, on the island of Kadiak.¹

The first settlement there was in 1800, by Baranoff, the superintendent of the Company, whose life was passed in this country, and whose name has been given to the island. But the settlement made slow progress. Lisiansky, who was there in 1804, records, that, "from his entrance into Sitka Sound, there was not to be seen on the shore the least vestige of habitation."² The natives had set themselves against a settlement. Meanwhile the seat of government was at Kadiak, of which we have an early and friendly glimpse. I quote what Lisiansky says, as exhibiting in a favorable light the beginning of the government, now transferred to the United States.

"The island of Kadiak, with the rest of the Russian settlements along the northwest coast of America, are super-

¹ Voyage, Tom. I. p. 153.

² Voyage, p. 145.

intended by a kind of governor-general or commander-in-chief, who has agents under him, appointed, like himself, by the Company at Petersburg. The smaller settlements have each a Russian overseer. These overseers are chosen by the governor, and are selected for the office in consequence of their long services and orderly conduct. They have the power of punishing, to a certain extent, those whom they superintend; but are themselves amenable to the governor, if they abuse their power by acts of injustice. The seat of government is the Harbor of St. Paul, which has a barrack, different store-houses, several respectable wooden habitations, and a church, the only one to be found on the coast."

From this time the Company seems to have established itself on the coast. Lisiansky speaks of a single hunting party of nine hundred men, gathered from different places, as Alaska, Kadiak, Cook's Inlet, Prince William Sound, and "commanded by thirty-six *toyons*, who are subordinate to the Russians in the service of the American Company, and receive from them their orders."² From another source I learn that the inhabitants of Kadiak and of the Aleutian Islands were regarded as "immediate subjects of the Company,"—the males from eighteen to fifty being bound to serve it for the term of three years each. They were employed in the chase. The population of Alaska and of the two great bays, Cook's Inlet and Prince William Sound, were also subject to the Company; but they were held to a yearly tax on furs, without regular service, and they could trade only with the Company; otherwise they were independent. This seems to have been before a division of the whole into dis-

¹ Voyage, pp. 214, 215.

² Ibid., p. 153.

tricts, all under the Company, which, though primarily for the business of the Company, may be regarded as so many distinct jurisdictions, each with local powers of government.

Among these were two districts which I mention only to put aside, as not included in the present cession: (1.) the Kurile Islands, being the group nestling near the coast of Japan, on the Asiatic side of the dividing line between the two continents; (2.) the Ross settlement in California, now abandoned.

There remain five other districts: (1.) the District of Atcha, with the bureau at this island, embracing the two western groups of the Aleutians known as the Andreanoffsky Islands and the Rat Islands, and also the group about Behring's Island, which is not embraced in the present cession;—(2.) the District of Oonalaska, with the bureau at this island, embracing the Fox Islands, the peninsula of Alaska to the meridian of the Shumagin Islands, including these, and also the Pribyloff Islands to the northwest of the peninsula;—(3.) the District of Kadiak, embracing the peninsula of Alaska east of the meridian of the Shumagin Islands, and the coast eastward to Mount St. Elias, with adjacent islands, including Kadiak, Cook's Inlet, and Prince William Sound; then northward along the coast of Bristol Bay, and the country watered by the Nushagak and Kuskokwim rivers; all of which is governed from Kadiak, with redoubts or palisaded stations at Nushagak, Cook's Inlet, and Prince William Sound;—(4.) the Northern District, embracing the country of the Kwichpak and of Norton Sound, under direction of the commander of the redoubt at St. Michael's; leaving the country northward, with

the islands St. Lawrence and St. Matthew, not included in this district, but visited directly from Sitka;—(5.) the District of Sitka, embracing the coast from Mount St. Elias, where the Kadiak district ends, southward to the latitude of $54^{\circ} 40'$, with adjacent islands. But this district has been curtailed by a lease of the Russian American Company in 1839 for the space of ten years, and subsequently renewed, where this Company, in consideration of the annual payment of two thousand otter skins of Columbia River, underlets to the Hudson Bay Company all its franchise for the strip of continent between Cape Spencer at the north and the latitude of $54^{\circ} 40'$, excluding adjacent islands.

The central government of all these districts is at Sitka, from which emanate all orders and instructions. Here also is the chief factory, the fountain of supplies and the store-house of proceeds.

The operations of the Government are seen in receipts and expenditures, including salaries and allowances. In the absence of a complete series of such statistics to the present time, I mass together what I have been able to glean in different fields, relating to particular years, knowing well its unsatisfactory character. But each item has instruction for us.

The capital of the Company, in buildings, wares, vessels, &c., was reported in 1833 at 3,658,577 rubles. In 1838 it possessed twelve vessels, with an aggregate capacity of 1,556 tons, most of which were built at Sitka. According to Wappäus, who follows Wrangell, the pay of the officers and workmen in 1832 amounted to 442,877 rubles. At that time the persons in its service numbered 1,025, of whom 556 were

Russians, 152 Creoles, and 317 Aleutians. In 1851 there were one staff officer, three officers of the imperial navy, one officer of engineers, four civil officers, thirty religious officers, and six hundred and eighty-six servants. The expenses from 1826 to 1833, a period of seven years, were 6,608,077 rubles. These become interesting, when it is considered, that, besides what was paid on account of furs and the support of persons in the service of the Company, were other items incident to government, such as ship-building, navigation, fortifications, hospitals, schools, and churches. From a later authority it appears that the receipts reported at St. Petersburg for the year 1855 were 832,749 rubles, against expenses, 683,892 rubles, incurred for "administration in Russia and the colonies," insurance, transportation, and duties. The relative proportion of these different expenses does not appear.

These are explained by other statistics, which I am able to give from the Report of Golowin, who furnishes the receipts and expenditures from 1850 to 1859, inclusive. The silver ruble, which is the money employed in the table, is taken at our mint for seventy-five cents.

Receipts from 1850 to 1859, inclusive.

	Silver Rubles.
Tea traffic	4,145,869.76
Sale of furs	1,709,149.00
Commercial licenses	2,403,296.61
Other traffics	170,235.76
Total	8,528,551.13

Expenditures from 1850 to 1859, inclusive.

	Silver Rubles.
Sustenance of the colony	2,288,207.20
Colony's churches	71,723.18
Benevolent institutions	143,366.23
Principal administrative officers	1,536,436.49
Tea duty	1,764,559.85
Transportation and packing of tea	586,901.72
Purchase and transportation of merchandise	213,696.29
Insurance of tea and merchandise	217,026.55
Loss during war and by shipwreck	132,820.20
Reconstruction of Company's house in St. Petersburg	76,976.00
Capital for the use of the poor	6,773.02
Revenue fund capital	135,460.40
Dividends	1,354,604.00
Total	8,528,551.13

Analyzing this table, we arrive at a clearer insight into the affairs of the Company. If its receipts have been considerable, they have been subject to serious deductions. From the expenditures we also learn something of the obligations we are about to assume.

Another table shows that during this same period 122,006 rubles were received for ice, mostly sent to California, 26,399 rubles for timber, and 6,250 for coal. I think it not improbable that these items are included in the list of "receipts" under the term "other traffics."

In Russia the churches belong to the Government, and this rule prevails in these districts, where are four Greek churches and five Greek chapels. There is also a Protestant church at Sitka. I am glad to add that at the latter place there is a public library, which some years ago contained seventeen hundred volumes, together with journals, charts, atlases, mathematical and astronomical instruments. In Atcha, Oonalaska, Ka-

diak, and Sitka schools are reported at the expense of the Company, though not on a very comprehensive scale; for Admiral Wrangell mentions only ninety boys as enjoying these advantages in 1839. In Oonalaska and Kadiak there were at the same time orphan asylums for girls, where there were in all about thirty; but the Admiral adds, that "these useful institutions will, without doubt, be improved to the utmost." Besides these, which are confined to particular localities, there is said to be a hospital near every factory in all the districts.

I have no means of knowing if these territorial subdivisions have undergone recent modification. They will be found in the "*Russischen Besitzungen*" of Wrangell, published in 1839, in the "*Geographie*" of Wappäus in 1856, and in the "*Archiv von Russland*" of 1863, containing the article on the Report of Golowin. I am thus particular with regard to them from a double motive. Besides helping us to understand the government, they afford suggestions of practical importance in any future organization.

The Company has not been without criticism. Pictures of it are by no means rose color. These, too, furnish instruction. Early in the century its administration was the occasion of open and repeated complaint. It was pronounced harsh and despotic. Langsdorff is indignant that "a free trading company should exist independent, as it were, of the Government, not confined within any definite regulations, but who can exercise their authority free and uncontrolled, nay, even unpunished, over so vast an extent of country." In stating the case, he adds, that "the Russian subject here enjoys no protection of his property, lives in no security, and, if oppressed, has no one to whom he can

apply for justice. The agents of the factories, and their subordinate officers, influenced by humor or interest, decide everything arbitrarily." And this arbitrary power seems to have prevailed wherever a factory was established. "The stewardship in each single establishment is entirely despotic; though nominally depending upon the principal factory at Kadiak, these stewards do just what they please, without the possibility of their being called to account." If such was the condition of Russians, what must have been that of natives? Here the witness answers: "I have seen the Russian fur-hunters dispose of the lives of the natives solely according to their own arbitrary will, and put these defenceless creatures to death in the most horrible manner."¹ Our own D'Wolf records Langsdorff's remonstrance in behalf of "the poor Russians," and adds that it was "but to little purpose."² Krusenstern concurs in this testimony, and, if possible, darkens the colors. According to him, "Every one must obey the iron rule of the agent of the American Company; nor can there be either personal property or individual security, where there are no laws. The chief agent of the American Company is the boundless despot over an extent of country which, comprising the Aleutian Islands, stretches from 57° to 61° of latitude and from 130° to 190° of east longitude"; and he adds, in a note, "There are no courts of justice in Kadiak, nor any of the Company's possessions."³ Chamisso, the naturalist of Kotzebue's expedition, while confessing incompetency to speak on the treatment of the natives by the Company, declares "his wounded feelings and his commiseration."⁴ It is

¹ Voyages and Travels, Vol. II. pp. 69, 70.

³ Voyage, Vol. II. p. 107.

² Voyage, p. 54.

⁴ Voyage, Vol. III. p. 314.

too probable that the melancholy story of our own aborigines has been repeated. As these criticisms were by Russian officers, they must have had a certain effect. I cannot believe that the recent government, administered by the enlightened magistrates of whom we have heard, has been obnoxious to such terrible accusations; nor must it be forgotten that the report of Lisiansky, contemporaneous with those of Langsdorff and Krusenstern, is much less painful.

Baranoff, who had been so long superintendent, retired in 1818. He is much praised by Langsdorff, who saw him in 1805-6, and by Lütke, who was at Sitka in 1828. Both attribute to him a genius for his place, and a disinterested devotion to the interests of the Company, whose confidence he enjoyed to the end. D'Wolf says, "He possessed a strong mind, easy manners and deportment," and "commanded the greatest respect from the Indians."¹ Although administering affairs for more than a generation without rendering accounts, he died poor. He was succeeded by Captain Hagemeister. Since then, according to Lütke, an infinity of reforms has taken place, by which order and system have been introduced.

The Russian officer, Captain Golowin, who visited these possessions in 1860, has recommended certain institutional reforms, which are not without interest at this time. His recommendations concern the governor and the people. According to him, the governor should be appointed by the Crown with the concurrence of the Company, removable only when his continuance is plainly injurious to the colony; he should be subject only to the Crown, and his powers should be limited,

¹ Voyage, p. 22.

especially in regard to the natives; he should provide protection for the colonists by means of cruisers, and should personally visit every district annually; the colonists, Creoles, and subject natives, such as the Aleutians, should be governed by magistrates of their own selection; the name of "free Creole" should cease; all disputes should be settled by the local magistrates, unless the parties desire an appeal to the governor; schools should be encouraged, and, if necessary, provided at the public expense. These suggestions, in the nature of a reform bill, foreshadow a condition of self-government in harmony with republican institutions.

It is evident that these Russian settlements, distributed through an immense region and far from any civilized neighborhood, have little in common with those of European nations elsewhere, unless we except the Danish on the west coast of Greenland. Nearly all are on the coast or the islands. They are nothing but "villages" or "factories" under protection of palisades. Sitka is an exception, due unquestionably to its selection as headquarters of the Government, and also to the eminent character of the governors who have made it their home. The executive mansion and the social life there have been described by recent visitors, who acknowledged the charms of politeness on this distant northwestern coast. Lütke portrays life among its fogs, and especially the attractions of the governor's house. This was in the time of Admiral Wrangell, whose wife, possessing a high education, embellished the wilderness by her presence, and furnished an example of a refined and happy household. His account of Sitkan hospitality differs in some respects from that of English writers who succeeded. He records that fish was the staple

dish at the tables of functionaries as well as of the poor, and that the chief functionary himself was rarely able to have meat for dinner. During the winter, a species of wild sheep, the Musmon or Argali, also known in Siberia, and hunted in the forests, furnished an occasional supply. But a fish diet did not prevent his house from being delightful, — as was that of Baranoff, at an earlier day, according to D'Wolf, who speaks of "an abundance of good cheer."¹

Sir Edward Belcher, the English circumnavigator, while on his voyage round the world, stopped there. From him we have an account of the executive mansion and fortifications, which will not be out of place in this attempt to portray the existing Government. The house is of wood, described as "solid," one hundred and forty feet in length by seventy feet wide, of two stories, with lofts, capped by a light-house in the centre of the roof, which is covered with sheet-iron. It is about sixty feet above the sea-level, and completely commands all the anchorage in the neighborhood. Behind is a line of picketed logs twenty-five feet in height, flanked at the angles by block-houses, loopholed and furnished with small guns and swivels. The fortifications, when complete, "will comprise five sides, upon which forty pieces of cannon will be mounted, principally old ship-guns, varying from twelve to twenty-four pounders." The arsenal is praised for the best of cordage in ample store, and for the best of artificers in every department. The interior of the Greek church was found to be "splendid, quite beyond conception in such a place as this." The school and hospital had a "comparative cleanliness and comfort, and much to

¹ Voyage, p. 51.

admire, — although a man-of-war's man's ideas of cleanliness are perhaps occasionally acute." But it is the social life which seems to have most surprised the gallant captain. After telling us that "on their Sunday all the officers of the establishment, civil as well as military, dine at the governor's," he introduces us to an evening party and dance, which the latter gave to show his English guest "the female society of Sitka," and records that everything "passed most delightfully," especially, that, "although the ladies were almost self-taught, they acquitted themselves with all the ease and elegance communicated by European instruction." Sir Edward adds, that "the society is indebted principally to the governor's elegant and accomplished lady — who is of one of the first Russian families — for much of this polish"; and he describes sympathetically her long journey through Siberia with her husband, "on horseback or mules, enduring great hardships, in a most critical moment, in order to share with him the privations of this barbarous region." But, according to him, barbarism is disappearing; and he concludes by declaring that "the whole establishment appears to be rapidly on the advance, and at no distant period we may hear of a trip to Norfolk Sound through America as little more than a summer excursion."¹ Is not this time near at hand?

Four years afterward, Sir George Simpson, governor-in-chief of the Hudson's Bay Company, on his overland journey round the world, stopped at Sitka. He had just crossed the continent by way of the Red River settlements to Vancouver. He, too, seems to have been pleased. He shows us in the harbor "five sailing ves-

¹ Voyage round the World, Vol. I. pp. 95-106.

sels, ranging between two hundred and three hundred and fifty tons, besides a large bark in the offing in tow of a steamer"; and he carries us to the executive mansion, already described, which reappears as "a suite of apartments, communicating, according to the Russian fashion, with each other, all the public rooms being handsomely decorated and richly furnished, commanding a view of the whole establishment, which was in fact a little village, while about half-way down the rock two batteries on terraces frowned respectively over the land and the water." There was another Administrator-General since the visit of Sir Edward Belcher; but again the wife plays her charming part. After portraying her as a native of Helsingfors, in Finland, the visitor adds: "So that this pretty and ladylike woman had come to this, her secluded home, from the farthest extremity of the Empire." Evidently in a mood beyond contentment, he says: "We sat down to a good dinner in the French style, the party, in addition to our host and hostess and ourselves, comprising twelve of the Company's officers"; and his final judgment seems to be given, when he says: "The good folks of New Archangel appear to live well. The surrounding country abounds in the chevreuril, the finest meat that I ever ate, with the single exception of moose," while "in a little stream which is within a mile of the fort salmon are so plentiful at the proper season, that, when ascending the river, they have been known literally to embarrass the movements of a canoe."¹ Such is the testimony.

With these concluding pictures I turn from the Government.

¹ Journey round the World, Vol. I. pp. 218, 219, 220, 227.

2. *Population.* — I come now to the Population, which may be considered in its numbers and in its character. In neither respect, perhaps, can it add much to the value of the country, except so far as native hunters and trappers are needed for the supply of furs. Professor Agassiz touches this point in a letter which I have just received from him, where he says: "To me the fact that there is as yet hardly any population would have great weight, as this secures the settlement to our race." But we ought to know something, at least, of the people about to become the subjects of our jurisdiction, if not our fellow-citizens.

First. In trying to arrive at an idea of their numbers, I begin with Lippincott's Gazetteer, as it is the most accessible, according to which the whole population in 1851, aboriginal, Russian, and Creole, was 61,000. The same estimate appears also in the London "Imperial Gazetteer" and in the "Geographie" of Wappäus. Keith Johnston, in his "Physical Atlas," calls the population, in 1852, 66,000. McCulloch, in the last edition of his "Geographical Dictionary," puts it as high as 72,375. On the other hand, the "Almanach de Gotha" for the present year calls it 54,000. This estimate seems to have been adopted substantially from the great work, "Les Peuples de la Russie," which I am disposed to consider as the best authority.

Exaggerations are common with regard to the inhabitants of newly acquired possessions, and this distant region is no exception. An enthusiastic estimate once placed its population as high as 400,000. Long ago, Schelekoff, an early Russian adventurer, reported that he had subjected to the Crown of Russia 50,000 persons

in the island of Kadiak alone.¹ But Lisiansky, who followed him there in 1804-5, says: "The population of this island, when compared with its size, is very small." After "the minutest research," he found that it amounted only to 4,000 souls.² It is much less now,—probably not more than 1,500.

It is easy to know the number of those within the immediate jurisdiction of the Company. This is determined by a census. Even here the aborigines are the most numerous. Then come the Creoles, and last the Russians. But here you must bear in mind a distinction with regard to the former. In Spanish America all of European parentage born there are "Creoles"; in Russian America this term is applicable only to those whose parents are European and native,—in other words, "half-breeds." According to Wrangell, in 1833, the census of dependants of the Company in all its districts was 652 Russians, 991 Creoles, and 9,016 Aleutians and Kadiaks, being in all 10,659. Of these, 5,509 were men and 5,150 were women. In 1851, according to the report of the Company, there was an increase of Creoles, with a corresponding diminution of Russians and aborigines, being 505 Russians, 1,703 Creoles, and 7,055 aborigines, in all 9,263. In 1857 there were 644 Russians, 1,903 Creoles, and 7,245 aborigines, in all 9,792, of whom 5,133 were men and 4,659 were women. The increase from 1851 to 1857 was only 529, or about one per cent. annually. In 1860 there were "some hundreds" of Russians, 2,000 Creoles, and 8,000 aborigines, amounting in all to 10,540, of whom 5,382 were men and 5,158 were

¹ Voyage, 1783-87: Coxe's Russian Discoveries (4th edit.), p. 219.

² Voyage, pp. 192, 193.

women. I am thus particular, that you may see how stationary population has been even within the sphere of the Company.

The number of Russians and Creoles at the present time in the whole colony cannot be more than 2,500. The number of aborigines under the direct government of the Company may be 8,000. There remain also the mass of aborigines outside the jurisdiction of the Company, and having only a temporary or casual contact with it for purposes of trade. In this respect they are not unlike the aborigines of the United States while in their tribal condition, described so often as "Indians not taxed." For the number of these outside aborigines I prefer to follow the authority of the recent work already quoted, "*Les Peuples de la Russie*," according to which they are estimated at between forty and fifty thousand.

Secondly. In speaking of *character*, I turn to a different class of materials. The early Russians here were not Pilgrims. They were mostly runaways, fleeing from justice. Langsdorff says, "The greater part of the Promüschleniks and inferior officers of the different settlements are Siberian criminals, malefactors, and adventurers of various kinds."¹ The single and exclusive business of the Promüschleniks was the collection of furs. But the name very early acquired a bad odor. Here again we have the same Russian authority, who, after saying that the inhabitants of the distant islands are under the superintendence of a Promüschlenik, adds, — "which is, in other words, under that of a rascal, by whom they are oppressed, tormented, and plundered in every possible way."² It must be re-

¹ *Voyages and Travels*, Vol. II. pp. 67, 68.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 69, 70.

membered that this authentic portrait is not of our day.

The aborigines are all, in common language, Esquimaux; but they differ essentially from the Esquimaux of Greenland, and they also differ among themselves. Though popularly known by this family name, they have as many divisions and subdivisions, with as many languages and idioms, as France once had. There are large groups, each with its own nationality and language; and there are smaller groups, each with its tribal idiom. In short, the great problem of Language is repeated here. Its forms seem to be infinite. Scientific inquiry traces many to a single root, but practically they are different. Here is that confusion of tongues which yields only to the presence of civilization; and it becomes more remarkable, as the idiom is often confined to so small a circle.

Looking at them ethnographically, we find two principal groups or races,—the first scientifically known as Esquimaux, and the second as Indians. By another nomenclature, having the sanction of authority and usage, they are divided into Esquimaux, Aleutians, Kenaïans, and Koloschians, being four distinct groups. The Esquimaux and Aleutians are reported Mongolian in origin. According to doubtful theory, they passed from Asia to America by the succession of islands beginning on the coast of Japan and extending to Alaska, which for this purpose became a bridge between the two continents. The Kenaïans and Koloschians are Indians, belonging to known American races. So that these four groups are ethnographically resolved into two, and the two are resolved popularly into one.

There are general influences more or less applica-

ble to all these races. The climate is peculiar, and the natural features of the country are commanding. Cool summers and mild winters are favorable to the huntsman and fisherman. Lofty mountains, volcanic forms, large rivers, numerous islands, and an extensive sea-coast constitute the great Book of Nature for all to read. None are dull. Generally they are quick, intelligent, and ingenious, excelling in the chase and in navigation, managing a boat as the rider his horse, until man and boat seem to be one. Some are very skilful with tools, and exhibit remarkable taste. The sea is bountiful, and the land has its supplies. From these they are satisfied. Better still, there is something in their nature which does not altogether reject the improvements of civilization. Unlike our Indians, they are willing to learn. By a strange superstition, which still continues, these races derive descent from different animals. Some are gentle and pacific; others are warlike. All, I fear, are slaveholders; some are cruel taskmasters; others, in the interior, are reputed cannibals. But the country back from the sea-coast is still an undiscovered secret.

(1.) Looking at them in ethnographical groups, I begin with the *Esquimaux*, who popularly give the name to the whole. They number about 17,000, and stretch along the indented coast from its eastern limit on the Frozen Ocean to the mouth of the Copper River, in 60° north latitude, excluding the peninsula of Alaska, occupied by Aleutians, and the peninsula of Kenai, occupied by Kenaian. More powerful races, of Indian origin, following the courses of the great rivers northward and westward, have gradually crowded the *Esquimaux* from the interior, until they constitute a belt on the

salt water, including the islands of the coast, and especially Kadiak. Their various dialects are traced to a common root, while the prevailing language betrays an affinity with the Esquimaux of Greenland, and the intervening country watered by the Mackenzie. They share the characteristics of that extensive family, which, besides spreading across the continent, occupies an extent of sea-coast greater than any other people of the globe, from which their simple navigation has sallied forth so as to give them the name of Phœnicians of the North. Words exclusively belonging to the Esquimaux are found in the dialects of other races completely strangers, as Phœnician sounds are observed in the Celtic speech of Ireland.

The most known of the Russian Esquimaux is the small tribe now remaining on the island of Kadiak, which from the beginning has been a centre of trade. Although by various intermixture they already approach the Indians of the coast, losing the Asiatic type, their speech remains a distinctive sign of race. They are Esquimaux, and I describe them in order to present an idea of this people.

The men are tall, with copper skins, small black eyes, flat faces, and teeth of dazzling whiteness. Once the women pierced the nostrils, the lower lip, and the ears, for ornaments; but now only the nostrils suffer. The aboriginal costume is still preserved, especially out of doors. Their food is mostly from the sea, without the roots or berries which the island supplies. The flesh and oil of the whale are a special luxury. The oil is drunk pure, or used to season other food. Accustomed to prolonged abstinence, they exhibit at times an appetite amounting to prodigy. In one night six men

were able to devour the whole of a large bear. A strong drink made from the strawberry and myrtle, producing the effect of opium, has yielded to brandy. Sugar and tea are highly esteemed; but snuff is a delight. Lisiansky records that they would go out of the way twenty miles merely for a pinch.¹ They have tools of their own, which they use with skill. Their baidars, or canoes, are distinguished for completeness of finish and beauty of form. Unlike those of the Koloschians, lower down on the coast, which are hollowed from trunks of trees, they are of seal-skins stretched on frames, with a single aperture in the covering to receive the person of the master. The same skill appears in the carving of wood, whalebone, and walrus-ivory. Their general mode of life is said to be like that of other tribes on the coast. To all else they add knowledge of the healing art and passion for gaming.

Opposite Kadiak, on the main-land east, are the Tchugatchi, a kindred tribe, speaking the same language, but a different dialect. Northward is a succession of kindred tribes, differing in speech, and each with local peculiarities, but all are represented as kind, courteous, hospitable, and merry. It is a good sign, that merriment should prevail. Their tribal names are derived from a neighboring river, or some climatic circumstance. Thus, for instance, those on the mighty Kwichpak have the name of Kwichpakmutes, or "inhabitants of the great river." Those on Bristol Bay are called by their cousins of Norton Sound Achkugmutes, or "inhabitants of the warm country"; and the same designation is applied to the Kadiaks. Warmth, like other things in this world, is comparative; and to an

¹ Voyage, p. 179, note.

Esquimaux at 64° north latitude another five degrees further south is in a "warm country." These northern tribes have been visited lately by our Telegraphic Exploring Expedition, which reports especially their geographical knowledge and good disposition. As the remains of Major Kennicott descended the Kwichpak, they were not without sympathy from the natives. Curiosity also had its part. At a village where the boat rested for the night, the chief announced that it was the first time white men had ever been seen there.

(2.) The *Aleutians*, sometimes called Western Esquimaux, number about 3,000. By a plain exaggeration, Knight, in his *Cyclopædia of Geography*, makes them 20,000. Their home is the archipelago of volcanic islands whose name they bear, and also a portion of the contiguous peninsula of Alaska. The well-defined type has already disappeared; but the national dress continues. This is a long shirt with tight sleeves, made from the skins of birds, either the sea-parrot or the diver. This dress, called the *parka*, is indispensable as clothing, blanket, and even as habitation, during a voyage, being a complete shelter against wind and cold. They, too, are fishermen and huntsmen; but they seem to excel as artificers. The instruments and utensils of the Oonalaskans have been noted for beauty. Their baidars were pronounced by Sauer "infinitely superior to those of any other island,"¹ and another navigator declares them "the best means yet discovered to go from place to place, either upon the deepest or the shallowest water, in the quickest, easiest, and safest manner possible."² These illustrate their nature, which is

¹ Billings's Expedition, p. 157.

² Langsdorff, Voyages and Travels, Vol. II. p. 43.

finer than that of their neighbors. They are at home on the water, and excite admiration by the skill with which they manage their elegant craft, so that Admiral Lütke recognized them as Cossacks of the Sea.

Oonalaska is the principal of these islands, and from the time they were first visited seems to have excited a peculiar interest. Captain Cook painted it kindly; so have succeeding navigators. And here have lived the islanders who have given to navigators a new experience. Alluding especially to them, the reporter of Billings's voyage says: "The capacity of the natives of these islands infinitely surpasses every idea that I had formed of the abilities of savages."¹ There is another remark of this authority which shows how they had yielded, even in their favorite dress, to the demands of commerce. After saying that formerly they had worn garments of sea-otter, he pathetically adds, "but not since the Russians have had any intercourse with them."² Poor islanders! Exchanging choice furs, once their daily wear, for meaner skins!

(3.) The *Kenaians*, numbering as many as 25,000, take their common name from the peninsula of Kenai, with Cook's Inlet on the west and Prince William Sound on the east. Numerous beyond any other family in Russian America, they belong to a widespread and teeming Indian race, which occupies all the northern interior of the continent, stretching from Hudson's Bay in the east to the Esquimaux in the west. This is the great nation called sometimes Athabascan, or, from the native name of the Rocky Mountains, on whose flanks they live, Chippewyan, but more properly designated as Tinneh, with branches in Southern Ore-

¹ Billings's Expedition, p. 273.

² Ibid., p. 155.

gon and Northern California, and then again with other offshoots, known as the Apaches and Navajoes, in Arizona, New Mexico, and Chihuahua, thirty degrees of latitude from the parent stem. Of this extended race, the northwestern branch, known to travellers as Loucheux, and in their own tongue as Kutchin, after occupying the inner portion of Russian America on the Yukon and the Porcupine, reached the sea-coast at Cook's Inlet, where they appear under the name of Kenaians. The latter are said to bear about the same relation, in language and intellectual development, to the entire group, as the islanders of Kadiak bear to the Esquimaux.

The Kenaians call themselves in their own dialect by yet another name, Thnainas, meaning Men; thus, by a somewhat boastful designation, asserting manhood. Their features and complexion associate them with the red men of America, as does their speech. The first to visit them was Cook, and he was struck by the largeness of their heads, which seemed to him disproportioned to the rest of the body. They were strong-chested also, with thick, short necks, spreading faces, eyes inclined to be small, white teeth, black hair, and thin beard, — their persons clean and decent, without grease or dirt. In dress they were thought to resemble the people of Greenland. Their boats had a similar affinity. But in these particulars they were not unlike the other races already described. They were clothed in skins of animals, with the fur outward, or sometimes in skins of birds, over which, for protection against rain, was a frock made from the intestines of the whale, "prepared so skilfully as almost to resemble our gold-beater leaf."¹ Their boats were of

¹ Cook, *Voyage to the Pacific*, Vol. II. p. 362.

seal-skin stretched on frames, and of different sizes. In one of these Cook counted twenty women and one man, besides children. At that time, though thievish in propensity, they were not unamiable. Shortly afterwards they were reported by Russian traders, who had much to do with them, as "good people," who behaved "in the most friendly manner."¹ I do not know that they have lost this character since.

Here, too, is the accustomed multiplicity of tribes, each with its idiom, and sometimes differing in religious superstition, especially on the grave question of descent from the dog or the crow. There is also a prevailing usage for the men of one tribe to choose wives from another tribe, when the tribal character of the mother attaches to the offspring, which is another illustration of the Law of Slavery, *Partus sequitur ventrem*. The late departure from this usage is quoted by the old men as a sufficient reason for the mortality which has afflicted the Kenaïans, although a better reason is found in the ravages of the small-pox, unhappily introduced by the Russians. In 1838, ten thousand persons on the coast are reported victims to this disease.

(4.) Last of the four races are the *Koloschians*, numbering about 4,000, who occupy the coast and islands from the mouth of the Copper River to the southern boundary of Russian America, making about sixteen settlements. They belong to an Indian group extending as far south as the Straits of Fuca, and estimated to contain 25,000 souls. La Pérouse, after considerable experience of the aborigines on the Atlantic coast, asserts that those he saw here are not Esquimaux.² The

¹ Billings's Expedition, p. 197.

² Voyage, Tom. II. p. 205.

name seems to be of Russian origin, and is equivalent to Indian. Here again is another variety of language, and as many separate nations. Near Mount St. Elias are the Yakutats, who are the least known; then come the Thlinkits, occupying the islands and coast near Sitka, and known in Oregon under the name of Stikines; and then again we have the Kygans, who, beginning on Russian territory, overlap Queen Charlotte's Island, beneath the British flag. All these, with their subdivisions, are Koloschians; but every tribe or nation has four different divisions, derived from four different animals, the whale, the eagle, the crow, and the wolf, which are so many heraldic devices, marking distinct groups.

Points already noticed in the more northern groups are repeated here. As among the Kenaians, husband and wife are of different animal devices. A crow cannot marry a crow. There is the same skill in the construction of canoes; but the stretched seal-skin gives place to the trunk of a tree shaped and hollowed, so that it sometimes holds forty persons. There are good qualities among Aleutians which the Koloschians do not possess; but the latter have, perhaps, stronger sense. They are of constant courage. As daring navigators they are unsurpassed, sailing six or seven hundred miles in open canoes. Some are thrifty, and show a sense of property. Some have developed an aptitude for trade unknown to their northern neighbors, or to the Indians of the United States, and will work for wages, whether in tilling the ground or other employment. Their superior nature discards corporal punishment, even for boys, as an ignominy not to be endured. They believe in a Creator, and in the immortality of the soul. But here a mystic fable is woven into their faith. The spirits of

heroes dead in battle are placed in the sky, and appear in the Aurora Borealis. Long ago a deluge occurred, when the human family was saved in a floating vessel, which, after the subsidence of the waters, struck on a rock and broke in halves. The Koloschians represent one half of the vessel, and the rest of the world the other half. Such is that pride of race which civilization does not always efface.

For generations they have been warriors, prompt to take offence, and vindictive, as is the nature of the Indian race, — always ready to exact an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. This character has not changed. As was the case once in Italy, the dagger is an inseparable companion. Private quarrels are common. The duel is an institution. So is slavery still, — having a triple origin in war, purchase, or birth. The slave is only a dog, and must obey his master in all things, even to taking the life of another. He is without civil rights; he cannot marry or possess anything; he can eat only offal; and his body, when released by death, is thrown into the sea. A chief sometimes sacrifices his slaves, and then another chief seeks to outdo his inhumanity. All this is indignantly described by Sir Edward Belcher and Sir George Simpson. But a slave once a freed-man has all the rights of a Koloschian. Here, too, are the distinctions of wealth. The rich paint their faces daily; the poor renew the paint only when the colors begin to disappear.

These are the same people who for more than a century have been a terror on this coast. It was Koloschians who received the two boats' crews of the Russian discoverer in 1741, as they landed in one of its wooded coves, and no survivor returned to tell their fate. They

were actors in another tragedy at the beginning of the century, when the Russian fort at Sitka was stormed and its defenders put to death, some with excruciating torture. Lisiansky, whose visit was shortly afterward, found them "a shrewd and bold, though a perfidious people," whose chiefs used "very sublime expressions," and swore oaths, like that of Demosthenes, "by their ancestors, by relatives living and dead, and called heaven, earth, the sun, moon, and stars to witness for them, particularly when they meant to deceive."¹ According to D'Wolf, "both sexes are expert in the use of fire-arms," and he saw them bathing in the sea with the thermometer below freezing, running over the ice, and "performing all manner of antics with the same apparent enjoyment as if it had been a warm spring."² The fort has been repeatedly threatened by these warriors, who multiply by reinforcements from the interior, so that the governor in 1837 reported, that, "although seven hundred only were now in the neighborhood, seven thousand might arrive in a few hours."³ A little later their character was recognized by Sir George Simpson, when he pronounced them "numerous, treacherous, and fierce," in contrast with Aleutians, whom he describes as "peaceful even to cowardice."⁴ And yet this fighting race is not entirely indocile, if we may credit recent report, that its warriors are changing to traders.

3. *Climate*. — From Population I pass to Climate, which is more important, as it is a constant force. Climate is the key to this whole region. It is the governing power which rules production and life, for

¹ Voyage, p. 167, note.

² Voyage, pp. 48, 49.

³ Belcher, Voyage, Vol. I. p. 94.

⁴ Journey round the World, Vol. I. p. 225.

Nature and man must each conform to its laws. Here at last the observations of science give to inquiry a solid support.

Montesquieu has some famous chapters on the influence of climate over customs and institutions.¹ Conclusions regarded in his day as visionary or far-fetched are now unquestioned truth. Climate is a universal master. But nowhere, perhaps, does it appear more eccentric than in the southern portion of Russian America. Without a knowledge of climatic laws, the weather here would seem like a freak of Nature. But a brief explanation shows how all its peculiarities are the result of natural causes which operate with a force as unerring as gravitation. Heat and cold, rain and fog, to say nothing of snow and ice, which play such a part, are not abnormal, but according to law.

This law has been known only of late years. Even so ingenious an inquirer as Captain Cook notices the mildness of the climate, without attempting to account for it. He records, that, in his opinion, "cattle might subsist in Oonalaska all the year round without being housed";² and this was in latitude $53^{\circ} 52'$, on the same parallel with Labrador, and several degrees north of Quebec; but he stops with a simple statement of the suggestive fact. This, however, was inconsistent with the received idea at the time. A geographer, who wrote a few years before Cook sailed, has a chapter in which, assuming that the climate of Quebec continues across the continent, he argues that America is colder than Asia. I refer to the "*Mémoires Géographiques*" of Engel.³

¹ De l'Esprit des Lois, Liv. XIV.

² Voyage to the Pacific Ocean, Vol. II. p. 520.

³ Part. III. § 6, pp. 196, 197.

He would have been astonished, had he seen the revelations of an isothermal map, showing precisely the reverse: that the climate of Quebec does not continue across the continent; that the Pacific coast of our continent is warmer than the corresponding Atlantic coast; and that America is warmer than Asia, so far at least as can be determined by the two opposite coasts. Such is the truth, of which there are plentiful signs. The Flora on the American side, even in Behring Strait, is more vigorous than that on the Asiatic side, and the American mountains have less snow in summer than their Asiatic neighbors. Among many illustrations of the temperature, I know none more direct than that furnished by the late Hon. William Sturgis, of Boston,—who was familiar with the Northwest Coast at the beginning of the century,—in a lecture on the Oregon question in 1845. After remarking that the climate there is “altogether milder and the winter less severe than in corresponding latitudes on this side the continent,” he proceeds to testify, that, as a proof of its mildness, he had “passed seven winters between the latitudes of 51° and 57° , frequently lying so near the shore as to have a small cable fast to the trees upon it, and only once was his ship surrounded by ice sufficiently firm to bear the weight of a man.”¹ But this intelligent navigator assigns no reason. To the common observer it seemed as if the temperature grew milder, travelling with the sun until it dipped in the ocean.

Among authorities open before me I quote two, which show that this difference of temperature between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts was imagined, if not actually recognized, during the last century. Portlock, the

¹ The Oregon Question, p. 28.

Englishman, who was on the coast in 1786, after saying that during stormy and unsettled weather the air had been mild and temperate, remarks that he is "inclined to think that the climate here is not so severe as has been generally supposed."¹ La Pérouse, the Frenchman, whose visit was the same year, having been before in Hudson's Bay, on the other side of the continent, says still more explicitly, "The climate of this coast seemed to me infinitely milder than that of Hudson's Bay, in the same latitude. We measured pines six feet in diameter and a hundred and forty feet high; those of the same species at Fort Prince of Wales and Fort York are of a dimension scarcely sufficient for studding-sail booms."² Langsdorff, when at Sitka in 1805-6, was much with D'Wolf, the American navigator, and records the surprise of the latter "at finding the cold less severe in Norfolk Sound than at Boston, Rhode Island, and other provinces of the United States, which lie more to the south."³ D'Wolf, in his own work, says: "January brought cold, but not severe weather"; and in February, the weather, though "rather more severe than the previous month," was "by no means so cold as in the United States, latitude 42°."⁴

All this is now explained by known forces in Nature. Of these the most important is a thermal current in the Pacific, corresponding to the Gulf Stream in the Atlantic. The latter, having its origin in the heated waters of the Gulf of Mexico, flows as a river through the ocean northward, encircling England, bath-

¹ Voyage, p. 118.

² Voyage, Tom. II. p. 187.

³ Voyages and Travels, Vol. II. pp. 101, 102.

⁴ Voyage, pp. 52, 53.

ing Norway, and warming all within its influence. A similar stream in the Pacific, sometimes called the Japanese Current, having its origin under the equator near the Philippines and the Moluccas, amid no common heats, after washing the ancient empire of Japan, sweeps north, until, forming two branches, one moves onward to Behring Strait, and the other bends east, along the Aleutian Islands, and then south, along the coast of Sitka, Oregon, and California. Geographers have described this "heater," which in the lower latitudes is as high as 81° of Fahrenheit, and even far to the north as high as 50° . A chart in Findlay's "Pacific Ocean Directory" portrays its course, as it warms so many islands and such an extent of coast. An officer of the United States Navy, Lieutenant Bent, in a paper before the Geographical Society of New York, while exhibiting the influence of this current in mitigating the climate of the Northwest Coast, mentions that vessels on the Asiatic side, becoming unwieldy with accumulations of ice on the hull and rigging, run over to the higher latitude on the American side and "thaw out." But the tepid waters which melt the ice on a vessel must change the atmosphere, wherever they flow.

I hope you will not regard the illustration as too familiar, if I remind you that in the economy of a household pipes of hot water are sometimes employed in tempering the atmosphere by heat carried from below to rooms above. In the economy of Nature these thermal currents are only pipes of hot water, modifying the climate of continents by carrying heat from the warm cisterns of the South into the most distant places of the North. So also there are sometimes pipes of hot air, having a similar purpose; and these, too,

are found in this region. Every ocean wind, from every quarter, traversing the stream of heat, takes up the warmth and carries it to the coast, so that the oceanic current is reinforced by an aërial current of constant influence.

These forces are aided essentially by the configuration of the Northwest Coast, with a lofty and impenetrable barricade of mountains, by which its islands and harbors are protected from the cold of the North. Occupying the Aleutian Islands, traversing the peninsula of Alaska, and running along the margin of the ocean to the latitude of $54^{\circ} 40'$, this mountain-ridge is a climatic division, or, according to a German geographer, a "climatic shed," such as perhaps exists nowhere else in the world. Here are Alps, some of them volcanic, with Mount St. Elias higher than Mont Blanc, standing guard against the Arctic Circle. So it seems even without the aid of science. Here is a dike between the icy waters of Behring Sea and the milder Southern Ocean. Here is a partition between the treeless northern coast and the wooded shores of the Kenaians and Koloschians. Here is a fence which separates the animal kingdom, having on one side the walrus and ice-fox from the Frozen Ocean, and on the other side the humming-bird from the tropics. I simply report the testimony of geography. And now you will not fail to observe how by this configuration the thermal currents of ocean and air are left to exercise their climatic power.

One other climatic incident here is now easily explained. Early navigators record the prevailing moisture. All are enveloped in fog. Behring names an island Foggy. Another gives the same designation to

a cape at the southern extremity of Russian America. Cook records fog. La Pérouse speaks of rain and continued fog in the month of August. And now visitors, whether for science or business, make the same report. The forests testify also. According to physical geography, it could not be otherwise. The warm air from the ocean, encountering the snow-capped mountains, would naturally produce this result. Rain is nothing but atmosphere condensed and falling in drops to the earth. Fog is atmosphere held in solution, but so far condensed as to become visible. This condensation occurs, when the air is chilled by contact with a colder atmosphere. These very conditions occur on the Northwest Coast. The ocean air, coming in contact with the elevated range, is chilled, until its moisture is set free.

Add to these influences, especially at Sitka, the presence of mountain masses and of dense forests, all tending to make the coast warmer in winter and colder in summer than it would otherwise be.

Practical observation verifies these conclusions of science. Any isothermal map is enough for our purpose; but there are others which show the relative conditions generally of different portions of the globe. I ask attention to those of Keith Johnston, in his admirable Atlas. But I am glad to present a climatic table of the Pacific coast in comparison with the Atlantic coast, recently compiled, at my request, from the archives of the Smithsonian Institution, with permission of its learned secretary, by a collaborator of the Institution, who visited Russian America under the auspices of the Telegraph Company. By this table we are able to comprehend the relative position of this region in the physical geography of the world.

Places of Observation.	Mean Temperature in Degrees Fahrenheit.					Precipitation in Rain or Snow. Depth in Inches.				
	Spring.	Summer.	Autumn.	Winter.	Year.	Spring.	Summer.	Autumn.	Winter.	Year.
St. Michael's, Russ. Am. Lat. 63° 28' 45" N.	28.75	52.25	27.00	7.00	27.48
Fort Yukon, Russ. Am. Lat. (near) 67°.	14.22	59.67	17.37	-23.80	16.92
Ikogmut, Russ. Am. . .	19.62	49.32	36.05	0.95	24.57
Sitka, Russ. Am. . . .	39.65	53.37	43.80	32.30	42.28	18.32	15.75	32.10	23.77	89.94
Puget Sound, Wash. T. Lat. 47° 7'.	48.88	63.44	51.30	39.38	50.75	7.52	3.68	15.13	20.65	46.98
Astoria, Oregon . . .	51.16	61.36	53.55	42.43	52.13	16.43	4.85	21.77	44.15	87.20
San Francisco, Cal. Lat. 37° 48'.	55.39	58.98	58.29	50.25	55.73	6.65	0.09	2.69	13.49	22.92
Nain, Labrador	23.67	48.57	33.65	0.40	26.40
Montreal, Canada East Lat. 45° 30'.	41.20	68.53	44.93	16.40	42.77	7.66	11.20	7.42	0.72	27.00
Portland, Maine . . .	40.12	63.75	45.75	21.52	42.78
Fort Hamilton, N. Y. .	47.84	71.35	55.79	32.32	51.82	11.69	11.64	9.88	10.31	43.52
Washington, D. C. . .	54.19	73.07	53.91	33.57	53.69	10.43	10.53	10.16	10.06	41.23

It is seen here that the winters of Sitka are relatively warm, not differing much from those of Washington; but the summers are colder. The mean temperature of winter is 32.30°, while that of summer is 53.37°. The Washington winter is 33.57°; the Washington summer is 73.07°. These points exhibit the peculiarities of this coast, — warm winters and cool summers.

The winter of Sitka is milder than that of many European capitals. It is much milder than that of St. Petersburg, Moscow, Stockholm, Copenhagen, Berlin, or Bern. It is milder even than that of Mannheim, Stuttgart, Vienna, Sebastopol in the Crimea, or Turin. It is not much colder than that of Padua. According to

observations at Sitka in 1831, it froze only two days in December and seven days in January. In February, the longest frost lasted five days; in March, it did not freeze during the day at all, and rarely in the night. During the next winter, the thermometer did not fall below 21° Fahrenheit; in January, 1834, it reached 11°. On the other hand, a temperature of 50° has been noted in January. The roadstead is open throughout the year, and only a few landlocked bays are frozen.

The prevailing dampness at Sitka renders a residence there far from agreeable, although it does not appear injurious to health. England is also damp; but Englishmen boast that theirs is the best climate of the world. At Sitka the annual fall of rain is about ninety inches. The mean annual fall in all England is forty inches, although in mountainous districts of Cumberland and Westmoreland the fall amounts to ninety and even one hundred and forty inches. In Washington it is forty-one inches. The forests at Sitka are so wet that they will not burn, although frequent attempts have been made to set them on fire. The houses, which are of wood, suffer from constant moisture. In 1828 there were twenty days when it rained or snowed continuously; one hundred and twenty when it rained or snowed part of the day, and only sixty-six days of clear weather. Some years, only forty bright days have been counted. Hinds, the naturalist, records only thirty-seven "really clear and fine days."¹ A scientific observer who was there last year counted sixty. A visitor for fourteen days found only two when nautical observations could be made; but these were as fine as he had ever known in any country.

¹ Belcher's Voyage round the World, Appendix, Vol. II. p. 332.

The whole coast from Sitka to the peninsula of Alaska seems to have the same continuous climate, whether in temperature or moisture. The island of Kadiak and the recess of Cook's Inlet are outside this climatic curve, so as to be comparatively dry. Langsdorff reports winters "frequently so mild in the low parts of Kadiak that the snow does not lie upon the ground for any length of time, nor is anything like severe cold felt."¹ Belcher, on his passage between Montague and Hinchinbrook Islands, found an "oppressively hot sun."² The Aleutian Islands, further west, are somewhat colder than Sitka, although the difference is not great. The summer temperature is seldom above 66°; the winter temperature is more seldom as low as 2° below zero. The snow falls about the beginning of October, and is seen sometimes as late as the end of April; but it does not remain long on the surface. The mean temperature of Oonalaska is about 40°. Chamisso found the temperature of spring-water at the beginning of the year 38.50°. There are years when it rains on this island the whole winter. The fogs prevail from April till the middle of July, when for the time they are driven further north. The islands northward toward Behring Strait are proportionately colder; but I remind you that the American coast is milder than the opposite coast of Asia.

From Mr. Bannister I have an authentic statement with regard to the temperature north of the Aleutians, as observed by himself in the autumn of 1865 and the months following. Even here the winter does not seem so terrible as is sometimes imagined. During most of the time, work could be done with comfort in the open

¹ Voyages and Travels, Vol. II. p. 61.

² Voyage, Vol. I. p. 70.

air. Only when it stormed the men were kept within doors. In transporting supplies from St. Michael's to Nulato, a distance of two hundred and fifty miles, they found no hardship, even when obliged to bivouac in the open air.

On Norton Sound and the Kwichpak River winter may be said to commence at the end of September, although the weather is not severe till the end of October. The first snow falls about the 20th or 25th of September. All the small ponds and lakes were frozen early in October. The Kwichpak was frozen solid about the 20th or 25th of this month. On the 1st of November the harbor at St. Michael's was still open, but on the morning of the 4th it was frozen solid enough for sledges to cross on the ice. In December there were two thaws, one accompanied by rain for a day. The snow was about two feet deep at the end of the month. January was uniformly cold, and it was said that at a place sixty-five miles northeast of St. Michael's the thermometer descended to 58° below zero. February was usually mild all over the country. In the middle of the month there was an extensive thaw, with showers of rain. About half the snow disappeared, leaving much of the ground bare. March was pleasant, without very cold weather. Its mean temperature was 20° ; its minimum was 3° below zero. Spring commences on the Kwichpak the 1st of May, or a few days later, when the birds return and vegetation begins. The ice did not entirely disappear from the river till after the 20th of May. The sea-ice continued in the bay of St. Michael's as late as 1st June. The summer temperature is much higher in the interior than on the coast. Parties travelling on the Kwichpak in June complained sometimes of heat.

The river Yukon, which, flowing into the Kwich-pak, helps to swell that stream, is navigable for at least four, if not five, months in the year. The thermometer at Fort Yukon is sometimes at 65° below zero of Fahrenheit, and for three months of a recent winter it stood at 50° below zero without variation. In summer it rises above 80° in the shade; but a hard frost occurs at times in August. The southwest wind brings warmth; the northeast wind brings cold. Some years, there is no rain for months; and then, again, showers alternate with sunshine. The snow packs hard at an average of two and a half feet deep. The ice is four or five feet thick; in a severe winter it is six feet thick. Life at Fort Yukon, under these rigors of Nature, although far from inviting, is not intolerable.

Such is the climate of this extensive region, so far as known, along its coast, among its islands, and on its great rivers, from its southern limit to its most northern ice, with contrasts and varieties such as Milton describes:—

“For hot, cold, moist, and dry, four champions fierce,
Strive here for mastery.”

4. *Vegetable Products.*—Vegetable products depend upon climate. They are determined by its laws. Therefore what has been already said upon the one prepares the way for the consideration of the other; and here we have the reports of navigators and the suggestions of science.

From the time this coast was first visited, navigators reported the aspects which Nature assumed. But their opportunities were casual, and they necessarily confined themselves to what was most obvious. As civilization

did not exist, the only vegetable products were indigenous to the soil. At the first landing, on the discovery of the coast by Behring, Steller found among the provisions in one of the Indian cabins "a sweet herb dressed for food in the same manner as in Kamtchatka." That "sweet herb" is the first vegetable production of which we have record on this coast. At the same time, although ashore only six hours, this naturalist "gathered herbs, and brought such a quantity to the ship that the describing of them took him a considerable time." This description was afterwards adopted by Gmelin in his "*Flora Sibirica*."¹

Trees were noticed even before landing. They enter into descriptions, and are often introduced to increase the savage wildness of the scene. La Pérouse doubts "if the deep valleys of the Alps and the Pyrenees present a scene so frightful, but at the same time so picturesque that it would deserve to be visited by the curious, if it were not at one of the extremities of the earth."² Lisiansky, as he approached the coast of Sitka, records that "nothing presented itself to the view but impenetrable woods, reaching from the water-side to the very tops of the highest mountains"; that he "never saw a country so wild and gloomy; it appeared more adapted for the residence of wild beasts than of men."³ Lütke portrays the "savage and picturesque aspect" of the whole Northwest Coast.⁴

As navigators landed, they saw Nature in detail; and here they were impressed by the size of the trees. Cook finds at Prince William Sound "Canadian and spruce pine, and some of them tolerably large."⁵ La Pérouse

¹ Müller, *Voyages from Asia to America* (London, 1764), p. 85.

² *Voyage*, Tom. II. p. 191.

⁴ *Voyage*, Tom. I. p. 101.

³ *Voyage*, p. 145.

⁵ *Voyage*, Vol. II. p. 379.

describes pines measuring six feet in diameter and one hundred and forty feet in height, and then again introduces us to "those superb pines fit for the masts of our largest vessels."¹ Portlock notices in Cook's Inlet "wood of different kinds in great abundance, such as pine, black-birch, witch-hazel, and poplar; many of the pines large enough for lower masts for a ship of four hundred tons burden"; and then again at Prince William Sound "trees of the pine kind, some very large; a good quantity of alder; a kind of hazel, but not larger than will do for making handspikes."² Meares reports "woods thick," also "the black-pine in great plenty, capable of making excellent spars."³ Sauer, who was there a little later, in the expedition of Billings, reports that they "took in a number of fine spars"; and he proceeds to say: "The timber comprised a variety of pines of an immense thickness and height, some extremely tough and fibrous, and of these we made our best oars."⁴ Vancouver mentions, in latitude 60°, a "woodland country."⁵ Langsdorff describes trees in the neighborhood of Sitka, many of them measuring six feet in diameter and one hundred and fifty feet in height, "excellent wood for ship-building and masts."⁶ Lisiansky says, that, at Kadiak, "for want of fir, we made a new bowsprit of one of the pine-trees, which answered admirably."⁷ Lütke testifies to the "magnificent pine and fir" at Sitka, adding what seems an inconsistent judgment with regard to its durability.⁸ Belcher notices Garden Island, in latitude 60° 21', as "covered with pine-trees"; and then again, at Sitka, speaks of "a very

¹ Voyage, Tom. II. pp. 187, 188.

² Voyage, pp. 102, 251.

³ Voyages, Vol. I. pp. lxiv, lxv.

⁴ Expedition, pp. 197, 198.

⁵ Voyage, Vol. III. p. 95.

⁶ Voyages and Travels, Vol. II. p. 103.

⁷ Voyage, p. 191, note.

⁸ Voyage, Tom. I. p. 105.

fine-grained, bright yellow cypress" as the most valuable wood, which, besides being used in boats, was exported to the Sandwich Islands, in return especially for Chinese goods.¹

Turning westward from Cook's Inlet, the forests on the sea-line are rarer, until they entirely disappear. The first settlement on the island of Kadiak was on the southwestern coast; but the want of timber caused its transfer to the northeastern coast, where are "considerable forests of fine tall trees."² But where trees are wanting, grass seems to abound. This is the case with Kadiak, the peninsula of Alaska, and the Aleutian Islands generally. Of these, Oonalaska, libelled in the immortal verse of Campbell, has been the most described. This well-known island is without trees; but it seems singularly adapted to the growth of grass, which is often so high as to impede the traveller and to overtop even the willows. The mountains themselves are for a considerable distance clothed with rich turf. One of these scenes is represented in a print you will find among the views of the vegetation of the Pacific in the London reproduction of the work of Kittlitz. This peculiarity was first noticed by Cook, who says, with a sailor's sententiousness, that he did not see there "a single stick of wood of any size," but "plenty of grass, which grows very thick and to a great length."³ Lütke records, that, after leaving Brazil, he met nothing so agreeable as the grass of this island.

North of the peninsula of Alaska, on Behring Sea, the forests do not approach the coast, except at the

¹ Voyage, Vol. I. pp. 73, 97.

² Langsdorff, Voyages and Travels, Vol. II. p. 65.

³ Voyage, Vol. II pp. 425, 520.

heads of bays and sounds, although they abound in the interior, and extend even to within a short distance of the Frozen Ocean. Such is the personal testimony of a scientific observer recently returned from this region. In Norton Sound, Cook, who was the first to visit it, reports "a coast covered with wood, an agreeable sight," and, on walking into the country, small spruce-trees, "none of them above six or eight inches in diameter." A few days afterward "a party of men were sent on shore to cut brooms, and the branches of spruce-trees for brewing beer."¹ On the Kwichpak, and its affluent, the Yukon, trees are sometimes as high as a hundred feet. The supply of timber at St. Michael's is from the drift-wood of the river. Near Fort Yukon, at the junction of the Porcupine and Yukon, are forests of pine, poplar, willow, and birch. The pine is the most plentiful; but the small islands in the great river are covered with poplar and willow. Immense trunks rolling under the fort show that there must be large trees nearer the head-waters.

But even in northern latitudes the American coast is not without vegetation. Grass takes the place of trees. At Fort Yukon, in latitude 67°, there is "a thin, wiry grass." Navigators notice the contrast between the opposite coasts of the two continents. Kotzebue, while in Behring Strait, where the two approach each other, was struck by black, mossy rocks frowning with snow and icicles on the Asiatic side, while on the American side "even the summits of the highest mountains were free from snow," and "the coast was covered with a green carpet."² But the contrast with the Atlantic coast of the continent is hardly less. The northern limit of

¹ Voyage, Vol. II. pp. 476, 480, 482.

² Voyage, Vol. I. p. 249.

trees is full seven degrees higher in Russian America than in Labrador. In point of fact, on the Atlantic coast, in latitude $57^{\circ} 58'$, which is nearly that of Sitka, there are no trees. All this is most suggestive.

Next after trees, early navigators speak oftenest of berries, which they found in profusion. Not a sailor lands who does not find them. Cook reports "a variety of berries" at Norton Sound, and "great quantities" at Oonalaska.¹ Portlock finds at Prince William Sound "fruit-bushes in great abundance, such as bilberry-bushes, raspberry-bushes, strawberries, elder-berry-bushes, and currant-bushes, red and black," and "any quantity of the berries might be gathered for a winter's stock."² Meares saw there "a few black-currant-bushes."³ Billings finds at Kadiak "several species of berries, with currants and raspberries in abundance, the latter white, but extremely large, being bigger than any mulberry he had ever seen."⁴ Langsdorff notes most of these at Oonalaska, with cranberries and whortleberries besides.⁵ Belcher reports at Garden Island "strawberries, whortleberries, blaeberrries, pigeon-berries, and a small cranberry, in tolerable profusion, without going in search of them."⁶ These I quote precisely, and in the order of time.

Next to berries were plants for food; and these were in constant abundance. Behring, on landing at the Shumagin Islands, observed the natives "to eat roots which they dug out of the ground, and scarce shaken off the earth before they eat them."⁷ Cook reports at Oonalaska "a great variety of plants, several of them

¹ Voyage, Vol. II. pp. 478, 494.

⁵ Voyages and Travels, Vol. II. p. 34.

² Voyage, pp. 251, 252.

⁶ Voyage, Vol. I. p. 74.

³ Voyages, Vol. I. p. lxx.

⁷ Müller, Voyages, p. 90.

⁴ Expedition, p. 182.

such as we find in Europe and in other parts of America, particularly in Newfoundland: . . . all these we found very palatable, dressed either in soups or in salads.”¹ La Pérouse, who landed in latitude 58° 37', finds a French bill of fare, including celery, chicory, sorrel, and “almost all the pot-herbs of the meadows and mountains of France,” besides “several kinds of grass suitable for forage.” Every day and each meal the ship’s kettle was filled with these supplies, and all ate them in soups, ragouts, and salads, much to the benefit of their health.² Portlock mentions at Port Etches, besides “fine water-cresses,” “just above the beach, between the bay and the lake, a piece of wild wheat, about two hundred yards long and five yards wide, growing at least two feet high,” which, “with proper care, might certainly be made an useful article of food”; and at Cook’s Inlet he reports “ginseng and snake-root.”³ Meares reports at the latter place “inexhaustible plenty” of ginseng, and at Prince William Sound “snakeroot and ginseng, some of which the natives have always with them as a medicine.” He adds: “The ginseng of this part of America is far preferable to that of the eastern side.”⁴ Billings finds at Kadiak “ginseng, wild onions, and the edible roots of Kamtchatka,” and then again at Prince William Sound “plenty of ginseng and some snakeroot.”⁵ Vancouver finds at Port Mulgrave “wild vegetables in great abundance.”⁶ Langsdorff adds to the list, at Oonalaska, “that sweet plant, the Siberian parsnip.”⁷ These, too, I quote precisely, and in the order of time.

¹ Voyage, Vol. II. pp. 519, 520.

² Voyage, Tom. II. p. 188.

³ Voyage, pp. 118, 242.

⁴ Voyages, Vol. I. p. lxiv; II. p. 287.

⁵ Expedition, pp. 182, 198.

⁶ Voyage, Vol. III. p. 233.

⁷ Voyages and Travels, Vol. II. p. 34.

Since the establishment of Europeans on this coast, an attempt has been made to introduce the nutritious grains and vegetables known to the civilized world, but without very brilliant success. Against wheat and rye and against orchard fruits are obstacles of climate, perhaps insuperable. These require summer heat ; but here the summer is comparatively cold. The northern limit of wheat is several degrees below the southern limit of these possessions, so that this friendly grain is out of the question. Rye flourishes further north, as do oats also. The supposed northern boundary of these grains embraces Sitka and grazes the Aleutian Islands. But other climatic conditions are wanting, at least for rye. One of these is dry weather, which is required at the time of its bloom. Possibly the clearing of the forest may produce a modification of the weather. At present barley grows better, and there is reason to believe that it may be cultivated successfully very far to the north. It has ripened at Kadiak. Many garden vegetables have become domesticated. Lütke reports potatoes at Sitka, so that all have enough.¹ Langsdorff reports the same of Kadiak and Oonalaska.² There are also at Sitka radishes, cabbages, cauliflowers, peas, and carrots, — making a very respectable list. At Norton Sound I hear of radishes, beets, and cabbages. Even as far north as Fort Yukon, on the parallel of 67°, potatoes, peas, turnips, and even barley, have been grown ; but the turnips were unfit for the table, being rotten at the heart. A recent resident reports that there are no fruit-trees, and not even a raspberry-bush, and that he lost all his potatoes during one season by a frost in the

¹ Voyage, Tom. I. p. 118.

² Voyages and Travels, Vol. II. pp. 35, 62.

latter days of July; but do not forget that these potatoes were the wall-flowers of the Arctic Circle.

Thus it appears that the vegetable productions of the country are represented practically by trees. The forests, overshadowing the coast from Sitka to Cook's Inlet, are all that can be shown under this head out of which a revenue can be derived, unless we add ginseng, so much prized by the Chinese, and perhaps also snakeroot. Other things may contribute to the scanty support of a household; but timber will, in all probability, be an article of commerce. It has been so already. Ships from the Sandwich Islands have come for it, and there is reason to believe that this trade may be extended indefinitely, so that Russian America will be on the Pacific like Maine on the Atlantic, and the lumbermen of Sitka vie with their hardy brethren of the East.

These forests, as described, seem to afford all that can be desired. The trees are abundant, and they are perfect in size, not unlike

"the tallest pine
Hewn on Norwegian hills to be the mast
Of some great ammiral."

But a doubt has been raised as to their commercial value. Here we have the inconsistent testimony of Lütke. According to him, the pines and firs, which he calls "magnificent," constitute an untried source of commercial wealth. Not only California, but other countries, poor in trees, like Mexico, the Sandwich Islands, and even Chili, will need them. And yet he does not conceal an unfavorable judgment of the timber, which, as seen in the houses of Sitka, suffering from constant moisture, did not seem durable.¹ Sir

¹ Voyage, Tom. I. pp. 105, 151.
VOL. XV. — 8

Edward Belcher differs from the Russian admiral, for he praises especially "the timber of the higher latitudes, either for spars or plank."¹ Perhaps its durability may depend upon the climate where it is used; so that, though failing amidst the damps of Sitka, it may be lasting enough, when transported to another climate. In the rarity of trees on the islands and mainland of the Pacific, the natural supply is in Russian America. One of the early navigators even imagined that China must look this way, and he expected that "the woods would yield a handsome revenue, when the Russian commerce with China should be established."² American commerce with China is established. Perhaps timber may become one of its staples.

A profitable commerce in timber has already begun at Puget Sound. By official returns of 1866 it appears that it was exported to a long list of foreign countries and places, in which I find Victoria, Honolulu, Callao, Tahiti, Canton, Valparaiso, Adelaide, Hong Kong, Sydney, Montevideo, London, Melbourne, Shanghai, Peru, Coquimbo, Calcutta, Hilo, Cape Town, Cork, Guaymas, and Siam; and in this commerce were employed no less than eighteen ships, thirty barks, four brigs, twenty-eight schooners, and ten steamers. The value of the lumber and spars exported abroad was over half a million dollars, while more than four times that amount was shipped coastwise. But the coasts of Russian America are darker with trees than those further south. Pines, in which they abound, do not flourish as low down as Puget Sound. Northward, they are numerous and easily accessible.

In our day the Flora of the coast has been explored

¹ Voyage, Vol. I. p. 300.

² Lisiansky, Voyage, p. 236.

with care. Kittlitz, who saw it as a naturalist, portrays it with the enthusiasm of an early navigator; but he speaks with knowledge. He, too, dwells on the "surprising power and luxuriance" of the pine forests, describing them with critical skill. The trees which he identifies are the *Pinus Canadensis*, distinguished for its delicate foliage; the *Pinus Mertensiana*, a new species, rival of the other in height; and the *Pinus Palustris*, growing on swampy declivities, and not attaining height. In the clearings or on the outskirts of thickets are shrubs, being chiefly a species of *Rubus*, with flowers of carmine and aromatic fruit. About and over all are mosses and lichens, invigorated by the constant moisture, while colossal trees, undermined or uprooted, crowd the surface, reminding the scientific observer of the accumulations of the coal measures. Two different prints in the London reproduction of the work of Kittlitz present pictures of these vegetable productions grouped for beauty and instruction. I refer to these, and also to the Essay of Hinds on "The Regions of Vegetation," the latter to be found at the end of the volumes containing Belcher's Voyage.

In turning from the vegetable products of this region, it will not be out of place, if I refer for one moment to its domestic animals, for these are necessarily associated with such products. Some time ago it was stated that cattle had not flourished at Sitka, owing to the want of proper pasturage, and the difficulty of making hay in a climate of such moisture. Hogs are more easily sustained, but, feeding on fish, instead of vegetable products, their flesh acquires a fishy taste, which does not recommend it. Nor has there been great success with poultry, for this becomes the prey

of the crow, whose voracity here is absolutely fabulous. A Koloschian tribe traces its origin to this bird, which in this neighborhood might be a fit progenitor. Not content with swooping upon hens and chickens, it descends upon swine to nibble at their tails, and so successfully "that the hogs here are without tails," and then it scours the streets so well that it is called the Scavenger of Sitka. But there are other places more favored. The grass at Kadiak is well suited to cattle, and it is supposed that sheep would thrive there. The grass at Oonalaska is famous, and Cook thought the climate good for cattle, of which we have at least one illustration. Langsdorff reports that a cow grazed here luxuriously for several years, and then was lost in the mountains. That grazing animal is a good witness. Perhaps also it is typical of the peaceful inhabitants.

5. *Mineral Products.*—In considering the Mineral Products, I ask attention first to the indications afforded by the early navigators. They were not geologists. They saw only what was exposed. And yet, during the long interval that elapsed, not very much has been added to their conclusions. The existence of iron is hardly less uncertain now than then. The existence of copper is hardly more certain now than then. Gold, which is so often a dangerous *ignis-fatuus*, did not appear to deceive them. But coal, which is much more desirable than gold, was reported by several, and once at least with reasonable certainty.

The boat that landed from Behring, when he discovered the coast, found among other things "a whetstone on which it appeared that copper knives had

been sharpened." This was the first sign of the mineral wealth which already excites such interest. At another point where Behring landed, "one of the Americans had a knife hanging by his side, of which his people took particular notice on account of its unusual make."¹ It has been supposed that this was of iron. Next came Cook, who, when in Prince William Sound, saw "copper and iron." In his judgment, the iron came, "through the intervention of the more inland tribes, from Hudson's Bay, or the settlements on the Canadian lakes," and his editor refers in a note to the knife seen by Behring as from the same quarter; but Cook thought that the copper was obtained near at home, as the natives, when engaged in barter, gave the idea, "that, having so much of this metal of their own, they wanted no more."² Naturally enough, for they were not far from the Copper River. Maurelle, in 1779, landed in sight of Mount St. Elias, and he reports Indians with arrow-heads of copper, which "made the Spaniards suspect mines of this metal there."³ La Pérouse, who was also in this neighborhood, after mentioning that the naturalists of the expedition allowed no stone or pebble to escape observation, reports ochre, copper pyrites, garnets, schorl, granite, schist, horn-stone, very pure quartz, mica, plumbago, coal, and then adds that some of these substances announce that the mountains conceal mines of iron and copper. He reports further that the natives had daggers of iron, and sometimes of red copper; that the latter metal was common enough, serving for ornaments and for the points

¹ Müller, *Voyages from Asia to America*, pp. 85, 90.

² *Voyage*, Vol. II. pp. 379, 380.

³ La Pérouse, *Voyage*, Introduction, Tom. I. p. 340.

of arrows; and he then states the very question of Cook with regard to the acquisition of these metals. He insists also that "the natives know how to forge iron and work copper."¹ Spears and arrows "pointed with bone or iron," and also "an iron dagger" for each man, appear in Vancouver's account of the natives on the parallel of 55°, just within the southern limit of Russian America.² Lisiansky saw at Sitka "a thin plate made of virgin copper" found on Copper River, three feet in length, and at one end twenty-two inches in breadth, with various figures painted on one side, which had come from the possession of the natives.³ Meares reports "pure malleable lumps of copper ore in the possession of the natives,"—one piece weighing as much as a pound, said to have been obtained in barter with other natives further north,—also necklaces and bracelets "of the purest ore."⁴ Portlock, while in Cook's Inlet, in latitude 59° 27', at a place called Graham's Harbor, makes another discovery. Walking round the bay, he saw "two veins of kernel coal situated near some hills just above the beach, and with very little trouble several pieces were got out of the bank nearly as large as a man's head." If the good captain did not report more than he saw, this would be most important; for, from the time when the amusing biographer of Lord Keeper North described that clean flaky coal which he calls "candle," because often used for its light, but which is generally called "cannel," no coal has been more of a household favorite. He relates, further, that, returning on board in the evening, he "tried some of the coal, and found it to

¹ Voyage, Tom. II. pp. 151, 152, 192, 207.

³ Voyage, p. 150.

² Voyage, Vol. II. pp. 335, 339.

⁴ Voyages, Vol. II. pp. 33, 34.

burn clear and well.”¹ Add to these different accounts the general testimony of Meares, who, when dwelling on the resources of the country, boldly includes “mines which are known to lie between the latitudes of 40° and 60° north, and which may hereafter prove a most valuable source of commerce between America and China.”²

It is especially when seeking to estimate the mineral products that we feel the want of careful explorations. We know more of the roving aborigines than of these stationary tenants of the soil. We know more of the trees. A tree is conspicuous; a mineral is hidden in the earth, to be found by chance or science. Thus far it seems as if chance only had ruled. The Russian Government handed over the country to a trading company, whose exclusive interest was furs. The company followed its business, when it looked to wild beasts with rich skins rather than to the soil. Its mines were above ground, and not below. There were also essential difficulties in the way of exploration. The interior was practically inaccessible. The thick forest, saturated with rain and overgrown with wet mosses, presented obstacles which nothing but enlightened enterprise could overcome. Even at a short distance from the port of Sitka all effort failed, and the inner recesses of the island, only thirty miles broad, were never penetrated.

The late Professor Henry D. Rogers, in his admirable paper on the Physical Features of America, being part of his contribution to Keith Johnston's Atlas, full of knowledge and of fine generalization, says of this northwest belt, that it is “little known in its topogra-

¹ Voyage, p. 108.

² Voyages, Vol. II. p. 291.

phy to any but the roving Indians and the thinly scattered fur-trappers." But there are certain general features which he proceeds to designate. According to him, it belongs to what is known as the tertiary period of geology, intervening between the cretaceous period and that now in progress, but including also granite, gneiss, and ancient metamorphic rocks. It is not known if the true coal measures prevail in any part, although there is reason to believe that they exist on the coast of the Arctic Ocean between Cape Lisburne and Point Barrow.

Beginning at the south, we have Sitka and its associate islands, composed chiefly of volcanic rocks, with limestone near. Little is known even of the coast between Sitka and Mount St. Elias, which, itself a volcano, is the beginning of a volcanic region occupying the peninsula of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands, and having no less than thirty volcanoes, some extinct, but others still active. Most of the rocks here are volcanic, and the only fossiliferous beds are of the tertiary period. North of Alaska, and near the mouth of the Kwichpak, the coast seems volcanic or metamorphic, and probably tertiary, with a vein of lignite near the head of Norton Sound. At the head of Kotzebue Sound the cliffs abound in the bones of elephants and mammals now extinct, together with those of the musk-ox and other animals still living in the same latitude. From Kotzebue Sound northward, the coast has a volcanic character. Then at Cape Thompson it is called subcarboniferous, followed by rocks of the carboniferous age, being limestones, shales, and sandstones, which extend from Cape Lisburne far round to Point Barrow. At Cape Beaufort, very near the seventieth parallel of lat-

itude, and north of the Arctic Circle, on a high ridge a quarter of a mile from the beach is a seam of coal which appears to be of the true coal measures.

From this general outline, which leaves much in uncertainty, I come to what is more important.

It is not entirely certain that iron has been found, although frequently reported. Evidence points to the south, and also to the north. Near Sitka it was reported by the Russian engineer Doroschin, although it does not appear that anything has been done to verify his report. A visitor there, as late as last year, saw excellent iron, said to be from a bed in the neighborhood, reported inexhaustible, and with abundant wood for its reduction. Then again on Kotzebue Sound specimens have been collected. At $66^{\circ} 13'$ Kotzebue found a false result in his calculations, which he attributes to the disturbing influence of "iron."¹ A resident on the Yukon thinks that there is iron in that neighborhood.

Silver, also, has been reported at Sitka by the same Russian engineer who reported iron, and, like the iron, in "sufficient quantity to pay for the working."

Lead was reported by the Russian explorer, Lieutenant Zagoysskin, on the lower part of the Kwichpak; but it is not known to what extent it exists.

Copper is found on the banks of the Copper River, called by the Russians the Mjedinaja, meaning copper, and of its affluent, the Tchetchitno, in masses sometimes as large as forty pounds. Of this there can be little doubt. It is mentioned by Golowin, in the "Archiv" of Erman, as late as 1863. Undoubtedly from this neighborhood was obtained the copper which arrested the attention of the early navigators. Traces of copper are

¹ Voyage, Vol. I. p. 214.

found in other places on the coast; also in the mountains near the Yukon, where the Indians use it for arrow-heads.

Coal seems to exist all along the coast,—according to Golowin, “everywhere, in greater or less quantity.” Traces are reported on the islands of the Sitkan archipelago; and this is extremely probable, for it has been worked successfully on Vancouver’s Island below. It is also found on the Kenaian peninsula, Alaska, the island of Unga, belonging to the Shumagin group, Oonalaska, and far to the north at Cape Beaufort. At this last place it is “slaty, burning with a pure flame and rapid consumption,” and it is supposed that there are extensive beds in the neighborhood better in quality. For an account of this coal I refer to the scientific illustrations of Beechey’s Voyage. The natives also report coal in the interior on the Kwichpak. The coal of Oonalaska, and probably of Alaska, is tertiary, and not adapted for steamers. With regard to that of Unga scientific authorities are divided. That of the Kenaian peninsula is the best and the most extensive. It is found on the eastern side of Cook’s Inlet, half way between Cape Anchor and the Russian settlement of St. Nicholas, in veins three quarters of a yard or more in thickness, and ranging in quality from mere carboniferous wood to anthracite. According to one authority, these coal veins extend and spread far into the interior. This coal has more than once been sent to California for trial, and was there pronounced a good article. Since then it has been mined by the Company, not only for their own uses, but also for export to California. In making these statements, I rely particularly upon Golowin, in the “Archiv” of Erman, and

upon the elaborate work of Grewingk, in the "Transactions of the Mineralogical Society of St. Petersburg" for 1848 and 1849,¹ where is a special map of the Kenaian peninsula.

Gold is less important than coal, but its discovery produces more excitement. The report of gold in any quarter stimulates the emigrant or the adventurer hoping to obtain riches swiftly. Nor is this distant region without such experience. Only a few years ago, the British colony of Victoria was aroused by a rumor of gold in the mountains of the Stikine River, not far in the interior from Sitka. At once there was a race that way, and the solitudes of this river were penetrated by hunters in quest of the glittering ore. Discomfiture ensued. Gold had been found, but not in any sufficient quantities reasonably accessible. Nature for the present had set up obstacles. But failure in one place will be no discouragement in another, especially as there is reason to believe that the mountains here contain a continuation of those auriferous deposits which have become so famous further south. The Sierra Nevada chain of California reaches here.

Traces of gold have been observed at other points. One report places a deposit not far from Sitka. The same writer who reports iron also reports that during the last year he saw a piece of gold as large as a marble, which was shown by an Indian. But the Russian engineer, Doroschin, furnishes testimony more precise. He reports gold in at least three different localities, each of considerable extent. The first is the mountain range on the north of Cook's Inlet and extending into the peninsula of Alaska, consisting principally of clay slate

¹ Page 112.

with permeating veins of diorite, the latter being known as a gold-bearing rock. He observed this in the summer of 1851. About the same time, certain Indians from the Bay of Yakutat, not far from Mount St. Elias, brought him specimens of diorite found in their neighborhood, making, therefore, a second deposit. In the summer of 1855, the same engineer found gold on the southern side of Cook's Inlet, in the mountains of the Kenay peninsula. Satisfying himself, first, that the bank occupied by the redoubt of St. Nicholas, at the mouth of the Kaknu River, was gold-bearing, he was induced to follow the development of diorite in the upper valley of the river, and, as he ascended, found a gold-bearing alluvion, gradually increasing, with scales of gold becoming coarser and coarser, instead of scarcely visible, as at first.

It does not appear that the discoveries on Cook's Inlet were pursued; but it is reported that the Hudson's Bay Company, holding the country about the Bay of Yakutat under a lease from the Russian Company, have found the diorite in that neighborhood valuable. This incident has given rise to a recent controversy. Russian journals attacked the engineer for remissness in not exploring the Yakutat country. He has defended himself by setting out what he actually did in the way of discovery, and the essential difficulty at the time in doing more: all which will be found in a number, just received, of the work to which I have so often referred, the "Archiv" of Erman, for 1867.¹

Thus much for the mineral resources of this new-found country, as recognized at a few points on the extensive coast, leaving the vast unknown interior without a word.

¹ Band XXV. pp. 229, seqq.

6. *Furs.* — I pass now to Furs, which at times have vied with minerals in value, although the supply is more limited and less permanent. Trappers are “miners” of the forest, seeking furs as others seek gold. The parallel continues also in the greed and oppression unhappily incident to the pursuit. A Russian officer, who was one of the early visitors on this coast, remarks that to his mind the only prospect of relief for the suffering natives “consists in the total extirpation of the animals of the chase,” which he thought, from the daily havoc, must take place in a very few years.¹ This was at the close of the last century. The trade, though essentially diminished, still continues an important branch of commerce.

Early in this commerce, desirable furs were obtained in barter for a trifle; and when something of value was exchanged, it was much out of proportion to the furs. This has been the case generally in dealing with the natives, until their eyes have been slowly opened. In Kamtchatka, at the beginning of the last century, half a dozen sables were obtained in exchange for a knife, and a dozen for a hatchet; and the Kamtchadales wondered that their Cossack conquerors were willing to pay so largely for what seemed worth so little. Similar incidents on the Northwest Coast are reported by the early navigators. Cook mentions that in exchange for “beads” the Indians at Prince William Sound “readily gave whatever they had, even their fine sea-otter skins,” which they prized no more than other skins, until it appeared how much they were prized by their visitors.² Where there was no competition,

¹ Sauer, Billings's Expedition. p. 274.

² Voyage, Vol. II. pp. 357, 358.

prices rose slowly, and many years after Cook, the Russians at Oonalaska, in return for "trinkets and tobacco," received twelve sea-otter skins, and fox skins of different kinds to the number of near six hundred.¹ These instances show in a general way the spirit of this trade even to our own day. On the coast, and especially in the neighborhood of the factories, the difference in the value of furs is recognized, and a proportionate price obtained, which Sir Edward Belcher found in 1837 to be for "a moderately good sea-otter skin from six to seven blankets, increasing to thirteen for the best," together with "sundry knick-knacks."² But in the interior it is otherwise. A recent resident in the region of the Yukon assures me that he has seen skins worth several hundred dollars bartered for goods worth only fifty cents.

Beside whalers and casual ships, with which the Esquimaux are in the habit of dealing, the commerce in furs, on both sides of the continent, north of the United States, has for a long time been in the hands of two corporations, — being the Hudson's Bay Company, with directors in London, and the Russian American Company, with directors in St. Petersburg. The former is much the older of the two, and has been the most flourishing. Its original members were none other than Prince Rupert, the Duke of Albemarle, Earl Craven, Lord Ashley, and other eminent associates, who received a charter from Charles the Second, in 1670, to prosecute a search after a new passage to the South Sea, and to establish a trade in furs, minerals, and other considerable commodities in all those seas, and in the British possessions north and west of Canada, with

¹ Billings's Expedition, p. 277.

² Voyage, Vol. I. p. 101.

powers of government, the whole constituting a colossal monopoly, which stretched from Labrador and Baffin's Bay to an undefined West. At present this great corporation is known only as a fur company, to which all its powers are tributary. For some time its profits were so considerable that it was deemed advisable to hide them by nominal additions to the stock. With the extinction of the St. Petersburg corporation under the present treaty, the London corporation will remain the only existing fur company on the continent, but necessarily restricted in its operation to British territory. It remains to be seen into whose hands the commerce on the Pacific side will fall, now that this whole region will be open to the unchecked enterprise of our citizens.

This remarkable commerce began before the organization of the Russian Company. Its profits may be inferred from a voyage in 1772, described by Coxe, between Kamtchatka and the Aleutians. The tenth part of the skins being handed to the custom-house, the remainder were distributed in fifty-five shares, consisting each of twenty sea-otters, sixteen black and brown foxes, ten red foxes, and three sea-otter tails; and these shares were sold on the spot at from eight hundred to one thousand rubles each, so that the whole lading brought about fifty thousand rubles.¹ The cost of these may be inferred from the articles given in exchange. A Russian outfit, of which I find a contemporary record, was, among other things, "about five hundred weight of tobacco, one hundred weight of glass beads, perhaps a dozen spare hatchets and a few superfluous knives of very bad quality, an immense number of traps for foxes,

¹ Coxe, *Russian Discoveries*, (3d edit.,) pp. 11, 12.

a few hams, a little rancid butter.”¹ With such imports against such exports, the profits must have been considerable.

From Langsdorff we have a general inventory of furs at the beginning of the century in the principal magazine of the Russian Company on the island of Kadiak, drawn from the islands, the peninsula of Alaska, Cook's Inlet, Prince William Sound, and the continent generally. Here were “a great variety of the rarest kinds of fox skins,” black, blackish, reddish, silver gray, and stone fox, — the last probably a species of the Arctic; “brown and red bears, the skins of which are of great value,” and also “the valuable black bear”; the zisel marmot, and the common marmot; the glutton; the lynx, chiefly of whitish gray; the reindeer; the beaver; the hairy hedgehog; “the wool of a wild American sheep, whitish, fine, and very long,” but he could never obtain sight of the animal that produced this wool; also sea-otters, once “the principal source of wealth to the Company, now nearly extirpated, a few hundreds only being annually collected.”² Many of the same furs were reported by Cook on this coast in his day. They all continue to be found, — except that I hear nothing of wild sheep, save at a Sitkan dinner.

There has been much exaggeration with regard to the profits of the Russian corporation. An English writer of authority calls the produce “immense,” and adds that “formerly it was much greater.” I refer to the paper of Mr. Petermann, read before the Royal Geographical Society of London, in 1852.³ The number of skins at times is prodigious, although this fails to reveal

¹ Billings's Expedition, p. 275.

² Voyages and Travels, Vol. II. pp. 66, 73 - 75.

³ Journal, Vol. XXII. p. 120.

precisely the profits. For instance, Pribyloff collected within two years, on the islands northwest of Alaska which bear his name, the skins of 2,000 sea-otters, 40,000 sea-bears or ursine seals, 6,000 dark ice-foxes, together with 1,000 poods of walrus ivory.¹ The pood is a Russian weight of thirty-six pounds. Lütke mentions that in 1803 no less than 800,000 skins of the ursine seal were accumulated in the factory at Oonalaska, of which 700,000 were thrown into the sea, partly because they were badly prepared, and partly to keep up the price,²—thus imitating the Dutch, who for the same reason burned spices. Another estimate masses the collection for a series of years. From 1787 to 1817, for only part of which time the Company existed, the Oonalaska district yielded upwards of 2,500,000 seal-skins; and from 1817 to 1838, during all which time the Company was in power, the same district yielded 879,000 seal-skins. Assuming, what is improbable, that these skins were sold at twenty-five rubles each, some calculating genius has ciphered out the sum-total of proceeds at more than 85,000,000 rubles,—or, calling the ruble seventy-five cents, a sum-total of more than \$63,000,000. Clearly, the latter years can show no approximation to any such doubtful result.

Descending from these lofty figures, which, if not exaggerations, are at least generalities, and relate partly to earlier periods, before the existence of the Company, we shall have a better idea of the commerce, if we look at authentic reports for special periods. Admiral Von Wrangell, who was so long governor, must have been well informed. According to statements in his work,

¹ Journal of the Royal Geographical Society, Vol. XXII. p. 120.

² Voyage, Tom. I. p. 256.

adopted also by Wappäus in his "Geographie," the Company, from 1826 to 1833, a period of seven years, exported to Russia the skins of the following animals: 9,853 sea-otters, with 8,751 sea-otter tails, 39,981 river-beavers, 6,242 river or land otters, 5,243 black foxes, 7,759 black-bellied foxes, 16,336 red foxes, 24,189 polar foxes, 1,093 lynxes, 559 wolverenes, 2,976 sables, 4,335 swamp-otters, 69 wolves, 1,261 bears, 505 musk-rats, 132,160 seals; also 830 poods of whalebone, 1,490 poods of walrus-teeth, and 7,121 pairs of castoreum.¹ Their value does not appear. Sir George Simpson, the Governor-in-chief of the Hudson's Bay Company, who was at Sitka in 1841, represents the returns of the Company for that year, 10,000 fur-seals, 1,000 sea-otters, 2,500 land-otters, 12,000 beavers, and 20,000 walrus-teeth, without including foxes and martens.² There is a report for the year 1852, as follows: 1,231 sea-otters, 129 young sea-otters, 2,948 common otters, 14,486 fur-seals, 107 bears, 13,300 beavers, 2 wolves, 458 sables, 243 lynxes, 163 mole-skins, 1,504 pairs of castoreum, 684 black foxes, 1,590 cross foxes, 5,174 red foxes, 2,359 blue Arctic foxes, 355 white Arctic foxes, and also 31 foxes called white, perhaps albinos.

Besides these reports for special years, I am enabled to present, from the Russian tables of Captain Golowin, another, covering the period from 1842 to 1860, inclusive, — being 25,602 sea-otters, 63,826 otters, probably river-otters, 161,042 beavers, 73,944 foxes, 55,540 Arctic foxes, 2,283 bears, 6,445 lynxes, 26,384 sables, 19,076 musk-rats, 2,536 ursine seals, 338,604 marsh-otters, 712 brace of hare, 451 martens, 104 wolves, 46,274 casto-

¹ Wrangell, *Nachrichten über die Russischen Besitzungen*, pp. 23, 24. Wappäus, *Geographie*, p. 302.

² *Journey round the World*, Vol. I. pp. 221, 222.

reums, 7,309 beavers' tails. Here is an inexplicable absence of seal-skins. On the other hand are sables, which belong to Asia, and not to America. The list is Russian, and perhaps embraces furs from the Asiatic islands of the Company.

From a competent source I learn that the value of skins at Sitka during the last year was substantially as follows: Sea-otter, \$50; marten, \$4; beaver, \$2.50; bear, \$4.50; black fox, \$50; silver fox, \$40; cross fox, \$25; red fox, \$2. A recent price-current in New York gives the following prices there in currency: Silver fox, \$10 to \$50; cross fox, \$3 to \$5; red fox, \$1 to \$1.50; otter, \$3 to \$6; mink, \$3 to \$6; beaver, \$1 to \$4; musk-rat, \$0.20 to \$0.50; lynx, \$2 to \$4; black bear, \$6 to \$12; dark marten, \$5 to \$20. These New York prices vary from those of Sitka. The latter are the better guide to a comprehension of the proceeds at Sitka, subject to deduction for the expenses of the Company. Of the latter I say nothing now, as I have considered them in speaking of the existing Government.

The skins are obtained in three different ways: first, through the hunters employed by the Company; secondly, in payment of taxes imposed by the Company; and, thirdly, by barter or purchase from independent natives. But, with all these sources, it is certain that the Russian Company has enjoyed no success comparable to that of its British rival; and, still more, there is reason to believe that latterly its profits have not been large.

Amid all the concealment or obscurity which prevails with regard to revenues, it is easy to see that for some time to come there must be a large amount of valuable furs on this coast. The bountiful solitudes of

the forest and of the adjoining waters have not yet been exhausted; nor will they be, until civilization has supplied substitutes. Such, indeed, is part of that humane law of compensation which contributes to the general harmony. For the present there will be trappers on the land, who will turn aside only a little from prizes there to obtain from the sea its otter, seal, and walrus. It cannot be irrelevant, and may not be without interest, if I call attention briefly to those furbearing animals which are about to be brought within the sphere of republican government. If we cannot find their exact census, we may at least learn something of their character and value.

The comparative poverty of vegetation in the more northern parts of the continent contrasts with the abundance of animal life, especially if we embrace those tenants of the sea who seek the land for rest. These northern parallels are hardly less productive than the tropics. The lion, the elephant, and the hippopotamus find their counterpart in the bear, the walrus, and the seal, without including the sables and the foxes. Here again Nature, by unerring law, adapts the animal to the climate, and in providing him with needful protection creates also a needful supply for the protection of man; and this is the secret of rich furs. Under the sun of the tropics such provision is as little needed by man as by beast; and therefore Nature, which does nothing inconsistent with wise economy, reserves it for other places.

Among the furs most abundant in this commerce are those of the fox, in its different species and under its different names. Its numbers were noticed early, and gave the name to the eastern group of the Aleutians, which were called *Lyssie Ostrowa*, or Fox Islands.

Some of its furs are among the very precious. The most plentiful is the red, or, as sometimes called, American; but this is not highly prized. Then comes the Arctic, of little value, and of different colors, sometimes blue, and in full winter dress pure white, whose circumpolar home is indicated by its name. The cross fox is less known, but much more sought, from the fineness of its fur and its color. Its name is derived from dark cruciform stripes, extending from the head to the back and at right angles over the shoulders. It is now recognized to be a variety of the red, from which it differs more in commercial value than in general character. The black fox, which is sometimes entirely of shining black with silver white at the tip of the tail, is called also the silver fox, when the black hairs of the body are tipped with white. They are of the same name in science, sometimes called *argentatus*, although there seem to be two different names, if not different values, in commerce. This variety is more rare than the cross fox. Not more than four or five are taken during a season at any one post in the fur countries, although the hunters use every art for this purpose. The temptation is great, as we are told that "its fur fetches six times the price of any other fur produced in North America."¹ Sir John Richardson, the authority for this statement, forgot the sea-otter, of which he seems to have known little. Without doubt, the black fox is admired for rarity and beauty. La Hontan, the French commander in Canada under Louis the Fourteenth, speaks of its fur in his time as worth its weight in gold.²

¹ Richardson, *Fauna Boreali-Americana*, Part I. p. 94.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 94, 95.

Among the animals whose furs are less regarded are the wolverene, known in science as *Gulo*, or glutton, and called by Buffon the "quadruped vulture," with a dark brown fur, becoming black in winter, and resembling that of the bear, but not so long, nor of so much value. There is also the lynx, belonging to the feline race, living north of the Great Lakes and eastward of the Rocky Mountains, with a fur moderately prized in commerce. There is also the musk-rat, which is abundant in Russian America, as it is common on this continent, whose fur enters largely into the cheaper peltries of the United States in so many different ways, and with such various artificial colors that the animal would not know his own skin.

Among inferior furs I may include that very respectable animal, the black bear, reported by Cook "in great numbers," and "of a shining black color."¹ The grizzly bear is less frequent, and is inferior in quality of fur to all other varieties of the bear. The brown bear is supposed to be a variety of the black bear. The polar bear, which at times is a formidable animal, leaving a footprint in the snow nine inches long, was once said not to make an appearance west of the Mackenzie River; but he has been latterly found on Behring Strait, so that he, too, is included among our new population. The black bear, in himself a whole population, inhabits every wooded district from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from Carolina to the ice of the Arctic, being more numerous inland than on the coast. Langsdorff early remarked that he did not appear on the Aleutians, but on the continent, about Cook's Inlet and Prince William Sound, which are well wooded.² He

¹ Voyage, Vol. II. p. 293.

² Voyages and Travels, Vol. II. p. 74.

has been found even on the Isthmus of Panama. Next to the dog, he is the most cosmopolitan and perhaps the most intelligent of animals, and among those of the forest he is the most known, even to the nursery. His showy fur once enjoyed great vogue in hammer-cloths and muffs, and it is still used in military caps and pistol-holsters; so that he is sometimes called the Army bear. Latterly the fur has fallen in value. Once it brought in London from twenty to forty guineas. It will now hardly bring more than the same number of shillings.

The beaver, amphibious and intelligent, has a considerable place in commerce, and also a notoriety of its own as the familiar synonym for the common covering of a man's head; and here the animal becomes historic. By royal proclamation, in 1638, Charles the First of England commanded "that no beaver-makers whatsoever, from henceforth, shall make any hats or caps but of pure beaver."¹ This proclamation was the death-warrant of beavers innumerable, sacrificed to the demands of the trade. Wherever they existed over a wide extent of country, in the shelter of forests or in lodges built by their extraordinary instinct, they were pursued and arrested in their busy work. The importation of their skins into Europe during the last century was enormous, and it continued until one year it is said to have reached the unaccountable number of 600,000. I give these figures as I find them. Latterly other materials have been obtained for hats, so that this fur has become less valuable. But the animal is still hunted. A medicine supplied by him, and known as the *castoreum*, has a fixed place in the *Materia Medica*.

¹ Rymer, *Fœdera*, Vol. XX. p. 231.

The marten is perhaps the most popular of all the fur-bearing animals belonging to our new possessions. An inhabitant of the whole wooded region of the northern part of the continent, he finds a favorite home in the forests of the Yukon, where he needs his beautiful fur, which is not much inferior to that of his near relative, the far-famed Russian sable. In the trade of the Hudson's Bay Company the marten occupies the largest place, his skins for a single district amounting to more than fifty thousand annually, and being sometimes sold as sable. The ermine, which is of the same weasel family, is of little value except for its captivating name, although its fur finds a way to the English market in enormous quantities. The mink, also of the same general family, was once little regarded, but now, by freak of fashion in our country, this animal has ascended in value above the beaver, and almost to the level of the marten. His fur is plentiful on the Yukon and along the coast. Specimens in the museum of the Smithsonian Institution attest its occurrence at Sitka.

The seal, amphibious, polygamous, and intelligent as the beaver, has always supplied the largest multitude of furs to the Russian Company. The early navigators describe its appearance and numbers. Cook encountered them constantly. Excellent swimmers, ready divers, they seek rocks and recesses for repose, where, though watchful and never sleeping long without moving, they become the prey of the hunter. Early in the century there was a wasteful destruction of them. Young and old, male and female, were indiscriminately knocked on the head for the sake of their skins. Sir George Simpson, who saw this improvidence with an

experienced eye, says that it was hurtful in two ways: first, the race was almost exterminated; and, secondly, the market was glutted sometimes with as many as two hundred thousand a year, so that prices did not pay the expense of carriage.¹ The Russians were led to adopt the plan of the Hudson's Bay Company, killing only a limited number of males who had attained their full growth, which can be done easily, from the known and systematic habits of the animal. Under this economy seals have multiplied again, vastly increasing the supply.

Besides the common seal, there are various species, differing in appearance, so as to justify different names, and yet all with a family character,—including the sea-leopard, so named from his spots, the elephant seal, from his tusks and proboscis, and the sea-lion, with teeth, mane, and a thick cylindrical body. These are of little value, although their skins are occasionally employed. The skin of the elephant seal is strong, so as to justify its use in the harness of horses. There is also the sea-bear, or ursine seal, very numerous in these waters, whose skin, especially if young, is prized for clothing. Steller speaks with grateful remembrance of a garment he made from one, while on the desert island after the shipwreck of Behring.

Associated with the seal, and belonging to the same family, is the walrus, called by the British the sea-horse, the morse, or the sea-cow, and by the French *bête à la grande dent*. His two tusks, rather than his skin, are the prize of the hunter. Unlike the rest of the seal family, he is monogamous, and not polygamous. Cook vividly describes immense herds asleep on the

¹ Journey round the World, Vol. I. p. 222.

ice, with some of their number on guard, and, when aroused, roaring or braying very loud, while they huddled and tumbled together like swine.¹ At times their multitude is so great, that, before being aroused, several hundreds are slaughtered, as game in a park. Their hide is excellent for carriage-braces, and is useful about ship. But it is principally for their ivory that these hecatombs are sacrificed. A single tooth sometimes weighs several pounds. Twenty thousand teeth, reported as an annual harvest of the Russian Company, must cost the lives of ten thousand walrus. The ivory compares with that of the elephant, and is for some purposes superior. Long ago, in the days of Saxon history, a Norwegian at the court of Alfred exhibited to the king "teeth of great price and excellencie," from what he called a "horsewhale."² Unquestionably, they were teeth of walrus.

I mention the sea-otter last; but in beauty and value it is the first. In these respects it far surpasses the river or land otter, which, though beautiful and valuable, must yield the palm. It has also more the manners of the seal, with the same fondness for sea-washed rocks, and a maternal affection almost human. The sea-otter seems to belong exclusively to the North Pacific. Its haunts once extended as far south as the Bay of San Francisco, but long ago it ceased to appear in that region. Cook saw it at Nootka Sound.³ Vancouver reports in Chatham Strait an "immense number about the shores in all directions," so that "it was easily in the power of the natives to procure as many as they chose to be at the trouble of taking."⁴ D'Wolf,

¹ Voyage, Vol. II. p. 458.

³ Voyage, Vol. II. p. 295.

² Hakluyt (London, 1599), Vol. I. p. 5.

⁴ Voyage, Vol. III. p. 294.

while at Sitka, projected an expedition to California "for the purpose of catching sea-otter, those animals being very numerous on that coast."¹ But these navigators, could they revisit this coast, would not find it in these places now. Its present zone is between the parallels of 50° and 60° north latitude, on the American and Asiatic coasts, so that its range is comparatively limited. Evidently it was Cook who first revealed the sea-otter to Englishmen. In the table of contents of his second volume are the words, "Description of a Sea-Otter," and in the text is a minute account of this animal, and especially of its incomparable fur, "certainly softer and finer than that of any others we know of." Not content with description, the famous navigator adds, in remarkable words, "Therefore the discovery of this part of the continent of North America, where so valuable an article of commerce may be met with, cannot be a matter of indifference."² This account stimulated the commercial enterprise of that day. Other witnesses followed. Meares, describing his voyage, placed this fur high above all other furs,— "the finest in the world, and of exceeding beauty";³ and La Pérouse made it known in France as "the most precious and the most common peltry" of those regions.⁴ Shortly afterwards all existing information with regard to it was elaborately set forth in the Historical Introduction to the Voyage of Marchand, published at Paris under the auspices of the Institute.⁵

The sea-otter was known originally to the Russians in Kamtchatka, where it was called the sea-beaver; but the discoveries of Behring constitute an epoch in the

¹ Voyage, p. 29.

² Voyage, Vol. II. pp. 295, 296.

³ Voyages, Vol. II. p. 23.

⁴ Voyage, Tom. II. p. 190.

⁵ Tom. I. pp. lxxiii, seqq.

commerce. His shipwrecked crew, compelled to winter on the desert island now bearing his name, found this animal in flocks, ignorant of men and innocent as sheep, so that they were slaughtered without resistance, to the number of "near nine hundred."¹ Their value became known. Fabulous prices were paid by the Chinese, sometimes, according to Coxe, as high as one hundred and forty rubles.² At such a price a single sea-otter was more than five ounces of gold, and a flock was a gold mine. The pursuit of gold was renewed. It was the sea-otter that tempted the navigator, and subsequent enterprise was under the incentive of obtaining the precious fur. Müller, calling him a beaver, says, in his history of Russian Discovery, "The catching of beavers in those parts enticed many people to go to them, and they never returned without great quantities, which always produced large profits."³ All that could be obtained were sent to China, which was the objective point commercially for this whole coast. The trade became a fury. The animal, with exquisite purple-black fur, appeared only to be killed,—not always without effort, for he had learned something of his huntsman, and was now coy and watchful, so that the pursuit was often an effort; but his capture was always a triumph. The natives, accustomed to his furs as clothing, now surrendered them. Sometimes a few beads were the only pay. All the navigators speak of the unequal barter,—“any sort of beads,” according to Cook.⁴ The story is best told by Meares: “Such as were dressed in furs instantly stripped themselves, and

¹ Muller, *Voyages from Asia to America*, p. 101.

² *Russian Discoveries* (3d edit.), p. 14.

³ *Voyages from Asia to America*, p. 108.

⁴ *Voyage*, Vol. II. p. 357.

in return for a moderate quantity of large spike-nails we received sixty fine sea-otter skins."¹ Vancouver describes the "humble fashion" of the natives in poor skins as a substitute for the beautiful furs appropriated by "their Russian friends."² The picture is completed by the Russian navigator, when he confesses, that, after the Russians had any intercourse with them, the natives ceased to wear sea-otter skins.³ In the growing rage the sea-otter nearly disappeared. Langsdorff reports the race "nearly extirpated," since "the high price given for the skins induces the Russians, for the sake of a momentary advantage, to kill all they meet with, both old and young; nor can they see that by such a procedure they must soon be deprived of the trade entirely."⁴ This was in 1805. Since then the indiscriminate massacre has been arrested.

Meanwhile our countrymen entered into this commerce, so that Russians, Englishmen, and Americans were all engaged in slaughtering sea-otters, and selling their furs to the Chinese, until the market of Canton was glutted. Lisiansky, who was there in 1806, speaks of "immense quantities imported by American ships, — during the present season no less than twenty thousand."⁵ By-and-by the commerce was engrossed by the Russians and English. At length it passes into the hands of the United States, with all the other prerogatives belonging to this territory.

7. *Fisheries*. — I come now to the Fisheries, the last head of this inquiry, and not inferior to any other in

¹ Voyages, Vol. I. p. xxvii.

⁴ Voyages and Travels, Vol. II. pp. 73, 74.

² Voyage, Vol. III. p. 151.

⁵ Voyage, p. 281.

³ Billings's Expedition, p. 155.

importance, — perhaps the most important of all. What even are sea-otter skins, by the side of that product of the sea, incalculable in amount, which contributes to the sustenance of the human family?

Here, as elsewhere, in the endeavor to estimate the resources of this region, there is vagueness and uncertainty. Information is wanting; and yet we are not entirely ignorant. Nothing is clearer than that fish in great abundance are taken everywhere on the coast, around the islands, in the bays, and throughout the adjacent seas. The evidence is constant and complete. Here are oysters, clams, crabs, and a dainty little fish of the herring tribe, called the oolachan, contributing to the luxury of the table, and so rich in its oily nature that the natives are said to use it sometimes as a “candle.” In addition to these, which I name only to put aside, are those great staples of commerce and main-stays of daily subsistence, the salmon, the herring, the halibut, the cod, and, behind all, the whale. This short list is enough, for it offers a constant feast, with the whale at hand for light. Here is the best that the sea affords, for poor or rich, — for daily use, or the fast-days of the Church. Here also is a sure support, at least, to the inhabitants of the coast.

To determine the value of this supply, we must go further, and ascertain if these various tribes of fish, reputed to be in such numbers, are found under such conditions and in such places as to constitute a permanent and profitable fishery. This is the practical question, which is still undecided. It is not enough to show that the whole coast may be subsisted by its fish. It should be shown further that the fish of this coast can be made to subsist other places, so as to be-

come a valuable article of commerce. And here uncertainty begins. The proper conditions of an extensive fishery are not yet understood. It is known that certain fisheries exist in certain waters and on certain soundings, but the spaces of ocean are obscure, even to the penetrating eye of science. Fishing-banks known for ages are still in many respects a mystery, which is increased where the fishery is recent or only coast-wise. There are other banks which fail from local incidents. Thus, very lately a cod-fishery was commenced on Rockall Bank, one hundred and sixty-five miles northwest of the Hebrides, but the deep rolling of the Atlantic and the intolerable weather compelled its abandonment.

Before considering the capacity of this region for an extensive fishery, it is important to know such evidence as exists with regard to the supply; and here again we must resort to the early navigators and visitors. Their evidence, reinforced by modern reports, is an essential element, even if it does not entirely determine the question.

Down to the arrival of Europeans, the natives lived on fish. This had been their constant food, with small additions from the wild vegetation. In summer it was fish freshly caught; in winter it was fish dried or preserved. At the first landing, on the discovery, Steller found in the deserted cellar "store of red salmon," and the sailors brought away "smoked fishes that appeared like large carp and tasted very well."¹ This is the earliest notice of fish on this coast, which are thus directly associated with its discovery. The next of interest is the account of a Russian navigator, in 1768-9,

¹ Müller, *Voyages from Asia to America*, pp. 85, 86.

who reports at the Fox Islands, and especially Oon-alaska, "cod, perch, pilchards, smelts, roach."¹ Thus early the cod appears.

Repairing to Cook's Voyage, we find the accustomed instruction; and here I shall quote with all possible brevity. At Nootka Sound he finds fish "more plentiful than birds," of which the principal sorts, in great numbers, are "the common herring, but scarcely exceeding seven inches in length, and a smaller sort, the same with the anchovy or sardine," and now and then "a small brownish cod spotted with white."² Then again he reports at the same place "herrings and sardines, and small cod,"—the former "not only eaten fresh, but likewise dried and smoked."³ In Prince William Sound "the only fish got were some torsk and halibut, chiefly brought by the natives to sell."⁴ Near Kadiak he records, that, "having three hours' calm, our people caught upward of a hundred halibuts, some of which weighed a hundred pounds, and none less than twenty pounds,"—and he adds, naturally enough, "a very seasonable refreshment to us."⁵ In Bristol Bay, on the northern side of the promontory of Alaska, he reports "tolerable success in fishing, catching cod, and now and then a few flat-fish."⁶ In Norton Sound, still further north, he tells us, that, in exchange for four knives made from an old iron hoop, he obtained of the natives "near four hundred pounds weight of fish, which they had caught on this or the preceding day,—some trout, and the rest in size and taste somewhat between a mullet and a herring."⁷ On returning

¹ Levascheff : *Coxe's Russian Discoveries* (3d edit.), p. 211.

² *Voyage*, Vol. II. p. 298.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 320.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 379.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 417.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 432.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 481.

southward, stopping at Oonalaska, he finds "plenty of fish, at first mostly salmon, both fresh and dried,—some of the fresh salmon in high perfection"; also "salmon trout, and once a halibut that weighed two hundred and fifty-four pounds"; and in describing the habits of the islanders, he reports that "they dry large quantities of fish in summer, which they lay up in small huts for winter use."¹ Such is the testimony of Captain Cook.

No experience on the coast is more instructive than that of Portlock, and from his report I compile a succinct diary. July 20, 1786, at Graham's Harbor, Cook's Inlet, "The Russian chief brought me as a present a quantity of fine salmon, sufficient to serve both ships for one day." July 21, "In several hauls caught about thirty salmon and a few flat-fish"; also, further, "The Russian settlement had on one side a small lake of fresh water, in which they catch plenty of fine salmon." July 22, "The boat returned deeply loaded with fine salmon." July 28, latitude 60° 9', "Two small canoes came off from the shore; they had nothing to barter except a few dried salmon." July 30, "Plenty of excellent fresh salmon, which we obtained for beads and buttons." August 5, "Plenty of fine salmon." August 9, "The greatest abundance of fine salmon." August 13, off the entrance of Cook's Inlet, "Hereabouts would be a most desirable situation for carrying on a whale fishery, the whales being on the coast and close in shore in vast numbers, and there being convenient and excellent harbors quite handy for the business."² Soon after these entries the English navigator left the coast for the Sandwich Islands.

¹ Voyage, Vol. II. pp. 495, 511.

² Voyage, pp. 100-123.

Returning during the next year, Portlock continued to record his observations, which I abstract in brief. May 21, 1787, Port Etches, latitude $60^{\circ} 21'$, "The harbor affords very fine crabs and muscles." June 4, "A few Indians came alongside, bringing some halibut and cod." June 20, "Plenty of flounders; crabs now very fine; some of the people, in fishing alongside for flounders, caught several cod and halibut." June 22, "Sent the canoe out some distance into the bay, and it soon returned with a load of fine halibut and cod; this success induced me to send her out frequently with a fishing party, and they caught considerably more than what was sufficient for daily consumption." June 30, "In hauling the seine, we caught a large quantity of herrings and some salmon; the herrings, though small, were very good, and two hogsheads of them were salted for sea-store." July 7, "We daily caught large quantities of salmon, but, the unsettled state of the weather not permitting us to cure them on board, I sent the boatswain with a party on shore to build a kind of house to smoke them in." July 11, "The seine was frequently hauled, and not less than two thousand salmon were caught at each haul; the weather, however, preventing us from curing them so well as could have been wished, we kept only a sufficient quantity for present use, and let the rest escape. The salmon were now in such numbers along the shores that any quantity whatever might be caught with the greatest ease."¹ All this testimony of the English navigator is singularly explicit, while it is in complete harmony with that of the Russian visitors, and of Cook, who preceded Portlock.

The report of Meares is similar, although less minute.

¹ Voyage, pp. 229-241.

Speaking of the natives generally, he says, "They live entirely upon fish, but of all others they prefer the whale."¹ Then again, going into more detail, he says, "Vast quantities of fish are to be found, both on the coast and in the sounds or harbors. Among these are the halibut, herring, sardine, silver-bream, salmon, trout, cod, . . . all of which we have seen in the possession of the natives, or have been caught by ourselves." The sardines he describes as taken in such numbers "that a whole village has not been able to cleanse them." At Nootka the salmon was "of a very delicate flavor," and "the cod taken by the natives were of the best quality."²

Spanish and French testimony is not wanting, although less precise. Maurelle, who was on the coast in 1779, remarks that "the fish most abundant was the salmon and a species of sole or turbot."³ La Pérouse, who was there in 1786, mentions a large fish weighing sometimes more than a hundred pounds, and several other fish; but he preferred "the salmon and trout, which the Indians sold in larger numbers than could be consumed."⁴ A similar report was made in 1791 by Marchand, who finds the sea and rivers abounding in "excellent fish," particularly salmon and trout.⁵

Meanwhile came the Russian navigator Billings, in 1790; and here we have a similar report, only different in form. Describing the natives of Oonalaska, the book in which this visit is recorded says, "They dry salmon, cod, and halibut, for a winter's supply."⁶ At Kadiak it says, "Whales are in amazing numbers about

¹ Voyages, Vol. I. p. lrv.

² Ibid., Vol. II. pp. 29-32.

³ La Pérouse, Voyage, Introd., Tom. I. p. 333.

⁴ Voyage, Tom. II. p. 189.

⁵ Voyage, Tom. I. p. 235.

⁶ Expedition, p. 161.

the straits of the islands and in the vicinity of Kadiak." Then the reporter, who was the naturalist Sauer, says, "I observed the same species of salmon here as at Okhotsk, and saw crabs." Again, "The halibuts in these seas are extremely large, some weighing seventeen poods, or six hundred and twelve pounds avoirdupois. . . . The liver of this fish, as also of cod, the natives esteem unhealthy and never eat, but extract the oil from them."¹ Then, returning to Oonalaska the next year, the naturalist says, "The other fish are halibut, cod, two or three species of salmon, and sometimes a species of salmon very common in Kamtchatka, between four and five feet long."²

From Lisiansky, the Russian navigator, who was on the coast in 1804, and again in 1805, I take two passages. The first relates to the fish of Sitka. "For some time," he says, "we had been able to catch no fish but the halibut. Those of this species, however, which we caught were fine, some of them weighing eighteen stone, and were of an excellent flavor. This fish abounds here from March to November, when it retires from the coast till the winter is at an end."³ The other passage relates to the subsistence of the inhabitants during the winter. "They live," he says, "on dried salmon, train oil, and the spawn of fish, especially that of herrings, of which they always lay in a good stock."⁴

Langsdorff, who was there in 1805-6, is more full and explicit. Of Oonalaska he says: "The principal food consists of fish, sea-dogs, and the flesh of whales. Among the fish, the most common and most abundant are several sorts of salmon, cod, herrings, and holybutt.

¹ Expedition, pp. 181, 182.

² Ibid., p. 264.

³ Voyage, p. 164.

⁴ Ibid., p. 239.

The holybutts, which are the sort held in the highest esteem, are sometimes of an enormous size, weighing even several hundred pounds."¹ Of Kadiak he says: "The most common fish, those which, fresh and dry, constitute a principal article of food, are herrings, cod, holybutt, and several sorts of salmon; the latter come up into the bays and rivers at stated seasons and months, and are then taken in prodigious numbers by means of nets or dams."² Of Sitka he says: "We have several sorts of salmon, holybutt, whittings, cod, and herrings."³ A goodly variety. The testimony of Langsdorff is confirmed in general terms by his contemporary, D'Wolf, who reports: "The waters of the neighborhood abounded with numerous and choice varieties of the finny tribe, which could be taken at all seasons of the year."⁴

Lütke, also a Russian, tells us that he found fish the standing dish at Sitka, from the humblest servant to the governor; and he mentions salmon, herring, cod, and turbot. Of salmon there were no less than four kinds, which were eaten fresh when possible, but after June they were sent to the fortress salted. The herring appeared in February and March. The cod and turbot were caught in the straits during winter.⁵ Lütke also reports "fresh cod" at Kadiak.⁶

I close this abstract of foreign testimony with two English authorities often quoted. Sir Edward Belcher, while on the coast in 1837, records that "fish, halibut, and salmon of two kinds, were abundant and moderate, of which the crews purchased and cured great quanti-

¹ Voyages and Travels, Vol. II. p. 33.

² Ibid., p. 76.

³ Ibid., p. 108.

⁴ Voyage, p. 53.

⁵ Voyage, Tom. I. p. 116.

⁶ Ibid., p. 148.

ties.”¹ Sir George Simpson, who was at Sitka in 1841, says: “Halibut, cod, herrings, flounders, and many other sorts of fish, are always to be had for the taking, in unlimited quantities. . . . Salmon have been known literally to embarrass the movements of a canoe. About 100,000 of the last-mentioned fish, equivalent to 1,500 barrels, are annually salted for the use of the establishment.”² Nothing could be stronger as statement, and, when we consider the character of its author, nothing stronger as authority.

Cumulative upon all this accumulation of testimony is that of recent visitors. Nobody visits here without testifying. The fish are so demonstrative in abundance that all remark it. Officers of the United States navy report the same fish substantially which Cook reported, as far north as the Frozen Ocean. Scientific explorers, prompted by the Smithsonian Institution, report cod in Behring Strait, on the limits of the Arctic Circle. One of these reports, that, while anchored near Oonimuk, in 1865, the ship, with a couple of lines, caught “a great many fine cod, most of them between two and three feet in length.” He supposes that there is no place on the coast where they are not numerous. A citizen of Massachusetts, who has recently returned from prolonged residence on this coast, writes me from Boston, under date of March 8, 1867, that “the whale and cod fisheries of the North Pacific are destined to form a very important element in the wealth of California and Washington Territory, and that already numbers of fishermen are engaged there, and more are intending to leave.” From all this testimony there can

¹ Voyage, Vol. I. p. 85.

² Journey round the World, Vol. I. p. 227.

be but one conclusion, with regard at least to certain kinds of fish.

Salmon exists in unequalled numbers, so that this fish, so aristocratic elsewhere, becomes common. Not merely the prize of epicures, it is the food of all. Not merely the pastime of gentle natures, like Izaak Walton or Sir Humphry Davy, who employ in its pursuit an elegant leisure, its capture is the daily reward of the humblest. On Vancouver's Island it is the constant ration given out by the Hudson's Bay Company to the men in service. At Sitka ships are gratuitously supplied with it by the natives. By the side of the incalculable multitudes swarming out of the Arctic waters, haunting this extended coast, and peopling its rivers, so that at a single haul Portlock took not less than two thousand, how small an allowance are the two hundred thousand which the salmon fisheries of England annually supply!

Herring seem not less multitudinous than the salmon. Their name, derived from the German *Heer*, signifying an army, is amply verified, as on the coast of Norway they move in such hosts that a boat at times makes its way with difficulty through the compact mass. I do not speak at a venture, for I have received this incident from a scientific gentleman who witnessed it on the coast. This fish, less aristocratic than the salmon, is a universal food, but here it would seem enough for all.

The halibut, so often mentioned for size and abundance, is less generally known than the others. It is common in the fisheries of Norway, Iceland, and Greenland. In our country its reputation is local. Even at the seaport of Norfolk, in Virginia, it does not appear

to have been known before 1843, when its arrival was announced as that of a distinguished stranger: "Our market yesterday morning was enriched with a delicacy from the Northern waters, the halibut, a strange fish in these parts, known only to epicures and naturalists." The larger fish are sometimes coarse and far from delicate, but they furnish a substantial meal, while the smaller halibut is much liked.

The cod is perhaps the most generally diffused and abundant of all, for it swims in all the waters of the coast, from the Frozen Ocean to the southern limit, sometimes in immense numbers. It is a popular fish, and, when cured or salted, is an excellent food in all parts of the world. Palatable, digestible, and nutritious, the cod, as compared with other fish, is as beef compared with other meats; so that its incalculable multitudes seem to be according to a wise economy of Nature. A female cod is estimated to contain from three to nine million eggs.¹ Talk of multiplication a hundred fold,—here it is to infinity. Imagine these millions of eggs grown into fish, and then the process of reproduction repeated, and you have numbers which, like astronomical distances, are beyond human conception. But here the ravenous powers of other fish are more destructive than any efforts of the fisherman.

Behind all these is the whale, whose corporal dimensions fitly represent the space he occupies in the fisheries of the world, hardly diminished by petroleum or gas. On this extended coast and in all these seas he is at home. Here is his retreat and play-ground. This is especially the case with the right-whale, or, accord-

¹ London Philosophical Transactions, 1767, pp. 280, 291. Cuvier, Animal Kingdom, (London, 1827-35,) Vol. X. p. 508.

ing to whalers, "the *right* whale to catch," with bountiful supply of oil and bone, who is everywhere throughout this region, appearing at all points and swarming its waters. D'Wolf says, "We were frequently surrounded by them."¹ Meares says, "Abundant as the whales may be in the vicinity of Nootka, they bear no comparison to the numbers seen on the northern part of the coast."² At times they are very large. Kotzebue reports them at Oonalaska of fabulous proportions, called by the natives *Aliamak*, and so long "that the people engaged at the opposite ends of the fish must halloo very loud to be able to understand each other."³ Another whale, known as the bow-head, is so much about Kadiak that it is sometimes called the Kadiak whale. The valuable sperm-whale, whose head and hunch are so productive in spermaceti, belongs to a milder sea, but he sometimes strays to the Aleutians. The narwhal, with his long tusk of ivory, out of which was made the famous throne of the early Danish kings, belongs to the Frozen Ocean; but he, too, strays into the straits below. As no sea is now *mare clausum*, all these may be pursued by a ship under any flag, except directly on the coast and within its territorial limit. And yet the possession of this coast as a commercial base must necessarily give to its people peculiar advantages in the pursuit. What is done now under difficulties will be done then with facilities, such at least as neighborhood supplied to the natives even with their small craft.

In our country the whale fishery has been a great and prosperous commerce, counted by millions. It has

¹ Voyage, p. 63.

² Voyages, Vol. II. p. 23.

³ Voyage, Vol. I. p. 264.

yielded considerable gains, and sometimes large fortunes. The town of New Bedford, one of the most beautiful in the world, has been enriched by this fishery. And yet you cannot fail to remark the impediments which the business has been compelled to overcome. The ship was fitted on the Atlantic coast for a voyage of two or three years, and all the crew entered into partnership with regard to the oil. Traversing two oceans, separated by a stormy cape, it reaches at last its distant destination in these northern seas, and commences its tardy work, interrupted by occasional rest and opportunity to refit at the Sandwich Islands. This now will be changed, as the ship sallies forth from friendly harbors near the game which is its mighty chase.

From the whale fishery I turn to another branch of inquiry. Undoubtedly there are infinite numbers of fish on the coast; but to determine whether they can constitute a permanent and profitable fishery, there are at least three different considerations which must not be disregarded: (1.) The existence of banks or soundings; (2.) Proper climatic conditions for catching and curing fish; (3.) A market.

(1.) The *necessity of banks or soundings* is according to reason. Fish are not caught in the deep ocean. It is their nature to seek the bottom, where they are found in some way by the fisherman, armed with trawl, seine, or hook. As among the ancient Romans private luxury provided tanks and ponds for the preservation of fish, so Nature provides banks, which are immense fish-preserves. Soundings attest their existence in a margin along the coast; but it becomes important to know if they actually exist to much extent away from the coast.

On this point our information is already considerable, if not decisive.

The Sea and Strait of Behring, as far as the Frozen Ocean, have been surveyed by a naval expedition of the United States under Commander John Rodgers. From one of his charts, now before me, it appears, that, beginning at the Frozen Ocean and descending through Behring Strait and Behring Sea, embracing Kotzebue Sound, Norton Bay, and Bristol Bay, to the peninsula of Alaska, a distance of more than twelve degrees, there are constant uninterrupted soundings from twenty to fifty fathoms,—thus presenting an immense extent proper for fishery. South of the peninsula of Alaska another chart shows soundings along the coast, with a considerable extent of bank in the neighborhood of the Shumagins and Kadiak, being precisely where other evidence points to the existence of cod. These banks, north and south of Alaska, taken together, according to indications of the two charts, have an extent unsurpassed by any in the world.

There is another illustration full of instruction. It is a map of the world, in the new work of Murray on "The Geographical Distribution of Mammals," "showing approximately the one hundred fathom line of soundings," prepared from information furnished by the Hydrographic Department of the British Admiralty. Here are all the soundings of the world. At a glance you discern the remarkable line on the Pacific coast, beginning at 40° of north latitude, and constantly receding from the shore in a northwesterly direction; then, with a gentle sweep, stretching from Sitka to the Aleutians, which it envelops with a wide margin; and, finally, embracing and covering Behring Strait to the

Frozen Ocean: the whole space, as indicated on the map, seeming like an immense unbroken sea-meadow adjoining the land, and constituting plainly the largest extent of soundings in length and breadth in the known world, — larger even than those of Newfoundland added to those of Great Britain. This map, prepared by scientific authority, in the interest of science, is an unimpeachable and disinterested witness.

Actual experience is better authority still. I learn that the people of California have already found cod-banks in these seas, and have begun to gather a harvest. Distance was no impediment; for they were already accustomed to the Sea of Okhotsk, on the Asiatic coast. In 1866 no less than seventeen vessels left San Francisco for cod-fishery in the latter region. This was a long voyage, requiring eighty days in going and returning. On the way better grounds were discovered among the Aleutians, with better fish; and then again, other fishing-grounds, better in every way, were discovered south of Alaska, in the neighborhood of the Shumagins, with an excellent harbor at hand. Here one vessel began its work on the 14th of May, and, notwithstanding stormy weather, finished it on the 24th of July, having taken 52,000 fish. The largest catch in a single day was 2,300. The average weight of the fish dried was three pounds. Old fishermen compared the fish in quality and method of taking with those of Newfoundland. Large profits are anticipated. While fish from the Atlantic side bring at San Francisco not less than twelve cents a pound, it is supposed that Shumagin fish at only eight cents a pound will yield a better return than the coasting-trade. These flattering reports have arrested the attention of Petermann, the indefati-

gable geographical observer, who recounts them in his journal.¹

From an opposite quarter is other confirmation. Here is a letter, which I have just received from Charles Bryant, Esq., at present a member of the Massachusetts Legislature, but for eighteen years acquainted with these seas, where he was engaged in the whale fishery. After mentioning the timber at certain places as a reason for the acquisition of these possessions, he says :—

“But the chiefest value—and this alone is worth more than the pittance asked for it—consists in its extensive cod and halibut fish-grounds. To the eastward of Kadiak, or the Aleutian Islands, are extensive banks, or shoals, nearly, if not quite, equal in extent to those of Newfoundland, and as well stocked with fish. Also west of the Aleutian Islands, which extend from Alaska southwest half-way to Kamtchatka, and inclosing that part of land laid down as Bristol Bay, and west of it, is an extensive area of sea, varying from forty fathoms in depth to twenty, where I have found the supply of codfish and halibut unfailing. These islands furnish good harbors for curing and preparing fish, as well as shelter in storm.”

In another letter Mr. Bryant says that the shoals east of the entrance to Cook's Inlet widen as they extend southward to latitude 50°; and that there are also large shoals south of Prince William Sound, and again off Cross Sound and Sitka. The retired ship-master adds, that he never examined these shoals to ascertain their exact limit, but only incidentally, in the course of his regular business, that he might know when and where to obtain fish, if he wished them. His report goes beyond any chart of soundings I have seen, although, as

¹ Geographische Mittheilungen, 1867, p. 120.

far as they go, the charts are coincident. Cook particularly notices soundings in Bristol Bay, and in various places along the coast. Other navigators have done the same. Careful surveys have accomplished so much that at this time the bottom of Behring Sea and of Behring Strait, as far as the Frozen Ocean, constituting one immense bank, is completely known in depth and character.

Add to all this the official report of Mr. Giddings, acting surveyor-general of Washington Territory, made to the Secretary of the Interior in 1865, where he says:—

“Along the coast, between Cape Flattery and Sitka, in the Russian possessions, both cod and halibut are very plenty, and of a much larger size than those taken at the Cape, or further up the Straits and Sound. No one, who knows these facts, for a moment doubts but that, if vessels similar to those used by the Bank fishermen that sail from Massachusetts and Maine were fitted out here, and were to fish on *the various banks along this coast*, it would even now be a most lucrative business. . . . The cod and halibut on this coast, up near Sitka, are fully equal to the largest taken in the Eastern waters.”¹

From this concurring evidence, including charts and personal experience, it is easy to see that the first condition of a considerable fishery is not wanting.

(2.) *Climatic conditions* must exist also. The proverbial hardihood of fishermen has limits. Elsewhere weather and storm have compelled the abandonment of banks which promised to be profitable. On a portion of this coast there can be no such rigors. South of Alaska and the Aleutians, and also in Bristol Bay, im-

¹ Executive Documents, 39th Cong. 1st Sess., H. of R., No. 1, Vol. 2, p. 161.

mediately to the north of the peninsula of Alaska, the fishing-grounds will compare in temperature with those of Newfoundland or Norway. It is more important to know if the fish, when taken, can be properly cured. This is one of the privileges of northern skies. Within the tropics fish may be taken in abundance, but the constant sun does not allow their preservation. The constant rains of Sitka, with only a few bright days in the year, must prevent the work of curing on any considerable scale. But the navigators make frequent mention of dry or preserved fish on the coast, and it is understood that fish are now cured at Kadiak. "Dried fish" from this island is described by D'Wolf.¹ For a long time it was customary there to dry seal flesh in the air, which could not be done on the main-land. Thus the opportunity of curing the fish seems to exist near the very banks where they are taken, or Fuca Straits may be a "half-way house" for this purpose. The California fishermen carry their fish home to be cured, in which they imitate the fishermen of Gloucester. As the yearly fishing product of this port is larger than that of any other in North America, perhaps in the world, this example cannot be without weight.

(3.) The *market* also is of prime necessity. Fish are not caught and cured except for a market. Besides the extended coast, where an immediate demand must always prevail in proportion to increasing population, there is an existing market in California, amply attested by long voyages to Kamtchatka for fish, and by recent attempts to find fishing-grounds. San Francisco at one time took from Okhotsk nine hundred tons of fish, being about one eighth of the yearly fishing product of

¹ Voyage, p. 50.

Gloucester. Her fishing-vessels last year brought home from all quarters fifteen hundred tons of dried fish and ten thousand gallons of cod-liver oil. There is also a growing market in Washington and Oregon. But beyond the domestic market, spreading from the coast into the interior, there will be a foreign market of no limited amount. Mexico, Central America, and the States of South America, all Catholic in religion, will require this subsistence, and, being southern in climate, they must look northward for a supply. The two best customers of our Atlantic fisheries are Hayti and Cuba, Catholic countries under a southern sun. The fishermen of Massachusetts began at an early day to send cod to Portugal, Spain, and Italy, all Catholic countries under a southern sun. Our "salt fish" became popular. The Portuguese minister at London in 1785, in a conference with Mr. Adams on a commercial treaty with the United States, mentioned "salt fish" among the objects most needed in his country, and added, that "the consumption of this article in Portugal was immense, and he would avow that the American salt fish was preferred to any other, on account of its quality."¹ Such facts are more than curious.

But more important than the Pacific States of the American continent are the great empires of Japan and China, with uncounted populations depending much on fish. In China one tenth subsist on fish. Notwithstanding the considerable supplies at home, it does not seem impossible for an energetic and commercial people to find a market here of inconceivable magnitude, dwarfing the original fur-trade with China, once so tempting.

¹ John Adams to Secretary Jay, November 5, 1785 : Works, Vol. VIII. p. 339.

From this survey you can all judge the question of the fisheries, which I only state, without assuming to determine. You can judge if well-stocked fishing-banks have been found under such conditions of climate and market as to supply a new and important fishery. Already the people of California have anticipated the answer, and their enterprise has arrested attention in Europe. The journal of Petermann, the "*Geographische Mittheilungen*," for the present year, which is the authentic German record of geographical science, borrows from a San Francisco paper to announce these successful voyages as the beginning of a new commerce. If this be so, as there is reason to believe, these coasts and seas will have unprecedented value. The future only can disclose the form they may take. They may be a Newfoundland, a Norway, a Scotland, or perhaps a New England, with another Gloucester and another New Bedford.

INFLUENCE OF FISHERIES.

AN eminent French writer, an enthusiast on fishes, Lacepède, has depicted the influence of fisheries, which he illustrates by the herring, calling it "one of those natural products whose use decides the destiny of empires."¹ Without adopting these strong words, it is easy to see that such fisheries as seem about to be opened on the Pacific must exercise a wonderful influence over the population there, while they give a new spring to commerce, and enlarge the national resources. In these aspects it is impossible to exaggerate. Fishermen are not as other men. They have a character of their own, taking complexion from their life. In

¹ *Histoire Naturelle des Poissons*, Tom. V. p. 429.
VOL. XV. — 11

ancient Rome they had a peculiar holiday, with games, known as *Piscatorii Ludi*. The first among us in this pursuit were the Pilgrims, who, even before they left Leyden, looked to fishing for support in their new home, giving occasion to the remark of King James: "So God have my soul, 't is an honest trade; 't was the Apostles' own calling."¹ As soon as they reached Plymouth they began to fish, and afterwards appropriated the profits of the fisheries at Cape Cod to found a free school. From this Pilgrim origin are derived those fisheries which for a while were our chief commerce, and still continue an important element of national wealth. The cod fisheries of the United States are now valued at more than two million dollars annually. Such an interest must be felt far and near, commercially and financially, while it contributes to the comfort of all. How soon it may prevail on the Pacific who can say? But this treaty is the beginning.

It is difficult to estimate what is so uncertain, or at least is prospective only. Our own fisheries, now so considerable, were small in the beginning; they were small, even when they inspired the eloquence of Burke, in that most splendid page never equalled even by himself.² But the Continental Congress, in its original instructions to its commissioners for the negotiation of treaties of peace and commerce with Great Britain, required, as a fundamental condition, next to independence, that these fisheries should be preserved unimpaired. While the proposition was under discussion, Elbridge Gerry, who had grown up among the fisher-

¹ Winslow's Brief Narration: Young's Chronicles of the Pilgrims, p. 383.

² Speech on Conciliation with America, March 22, 1775: Works (Boston, 1865-67), Vol. II. pp. 116-118.

men of Massachusetts, repelled the attack upon their pursuit in words which are not out of place here. "It is not so much fishing," he said, "as enterprise, industry, and employment. It is not fish merely; it is gold, the produce of that avocation. It is the employment of those who would otherwise be idle, the food of those who would otherwise be hungry, the wealth of those who would otherwise be poor."¹ After debate, it was resolved by Congress that "the common right of fishing should in no case be given up."² For this principle the eldest Adams contended with ability and constancy until it was fixed in the treaty of peace, where it stands side by side with the acknowledgment of independence.

In the discussions which ended thus triumphantly, the argument for the fisheries was stated most compactly by Ralph Izard, of South Carolina, in a letter to John Adams, dated at Paris, 24th September, 1778; and this early voice from South Carolina may be repeated now.

"Since the advantages of commerce have been well understood, the fisheries have been looked upon by the naval powers of Europe as an object of the greatest importance. The French have been increasing their fishery ever since the Treaty of Utrecht, which has enabled them to rival Great Britain at sea. The fisheries of Holland were not only the first rise of the Republic, but have been the constant support of all her commerce and navigation. This branch of trade is of such concern to the Dutch that in their public prayers they are said to request the Supreme Being 'that it would please Him to bless the Government, the Lords, the

¹ Austin's Life of Gerry, Vol. I. p. 289.

² Secret Journals, Vol. II. pp. 161, 230.

States, and also their fisheries.' The fishery of Newfoundland appears to me to be a mine of infinitely greater value than Mexico and Peru. It enriches the proprietors, is worked at less expense, and is the source of naval strength and protection."¹

Captain Smith, the adventurous founder and deliverer of the colony of Virginia, when appealing to Englishmen at home in behalf of the feeble New England settlements, especially dwells upon the fisheries. "Therefore," he concludes, "honourable and worthy Countrymen, let not the meannesse of the word fish distaste you, for it will afford as good gold as the Mines of *Guiana* or *Potassie*, with lesse hazard and charge, and more certainty and facility."² Doubtless for a long time the neighboring fish-banks were the gold-mines of New England.

I have grouped these allusions that you may see how the fisheries of that day, though comparatively small, enlisted the energies of our fathers. Tradition confirms the record. The sculptured image of a cod pendent from the ceiling in the hall of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, where it was placed during the last century, constantly recalls this industrial and commercial staple, with the great part it performed. And now it is my duty to remind you that these fisheries, guarded so watchfully and vindicated with such conquering zeal, had a value prospective rather than present, or at least small compared with what it is now. Exact figures, covering the ten years between 1765 and 1775, show that during this period

¹ Works of John Adams, Vol. VII. pp. 45, 46.

² The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles, (London, 1626,) p. 248.

Massachusetts employed annually in the fisheries 665 vessels, measuring 25,630 tons, with only 4,405 men.¹ In contrast with this interest, which seems so small, although at the time considerable, are the present fisheries of our country; and here again we have exact figures. The number of vessels in the cod fishery alone, in 1861, just before the blight of war reached this business, was 2,753, measuring 137,665 tons, with 19,271 men,—being more than four times as many vessels and men, and more than five times as much tonnage, as for ten years preceding the Revolution were employed annually by Massachusetts, representing at that time the fishing interest of the country.

Small beginnings, therefore, are no discouragement; I turn with confidence to the future. Already the local fisheries on this coast have developed among the generations of natives a singular gift in building and managing their small craft so as to excite the frequent admiration of voyagers. The larger fisheries there will naturally exercise a corresponding influence on the population destined to build and manage the larger craft. The beautiful baidar will give way to the fishing-smack, the clipper, and the steamer. All things will be changed in form and proportion; but the original aptitude for the sea will remain. A practical race of intrepid navigators will swarm the coast, ready for any enterprise of business or patriotism. Commerce will find new arms, the country new defenders, the national flag new hands to bear it aloft.

¹ Sabine, Report on the Fisheries, p. 174.

SUMMARY.

MR. PRESIDENT,—I now conclude this examination. From a review of the origin of the treaty, and the general considerations with regard to it, we have passed to an examination of these possessions under different heads, in order to arrive at a knowledge of their character and value. And here we have noticed the existing government, which was found to be nothing but a fur company, whose only object is trade; then the population, where a very few Russians and Creoles are a scanty fringe to the aboriginal races; then the climate, a ruling influence, with its thermal current of ocean and its eccentric isothermal line, by which the rigors of the coast are tempered to a mildness unknown in the same latitude on the Atlantic side; then the vegetable products, so far as observed, chief among which are forests of pine and fir waiting for the axe; then the mineral products, among which are coal and copper, if not iron, silver, lead, and gold, besides the two great products of New England, “granite and ice”; then the furs, including precious skins of the black fox and sea-otter, which originally tempted the settlement, and remain to this day the exclusive object of pursuit; and, lastly, the fisheries, which, in waters superabundant with animal life beyond any of the globe, seem to promise a new commerce. All these I have presented plainly and impartially, exhibiting my authorities as I proceeded. I have done little more than hold the scales. If these incline on either side, it is because reason or testimony on that side is the weightier.

WHAT REMAINS TO BE DONE.

As these extensive possessions, constituting a corner of the continent, pass from the imperial government of Russia, they will naturally receive a new name. They will be no longer Russian America. How shall they be called? Clearly, any name borrowed from classical antiquity or from individual invention will be little better than misnomer or nickname unworthy of the historic occasion. Even if taken from our own annals, it will be of doubtful taste. The name should come from the country itself. It should be indigenous, aboriginal, one of the autochthons of the soil. Happily such a name exists, as proper in sound as in origin. It appears from the report of Cook, the illustrious navigator, to whom I have so often referred, that the euphonious designation now applied to the peninsula which is the continental link of the Aleutian chain was the sole word used originally by the native islanders, "when speaking of the American continent in general, which they knew perfectly well to be a great land."¹ It only remains, that, following these natives, whose places are now ours, we, too, should call this "great land" Alaska.²

¹ Voyage, Vol. II. pp. 505, 506, October, 1778.

² The word Alaska was not improved when spelt *Alashka*, and the dropping of the letter *h* in *Oonalaska* seemed to show the better and more natural spelling. The following communication, more than a year after the Speech, was in answer to an inquiry about the spelling with an *i*, as *Aliaska*, which was adopted by several journals.

"SENATE CHAMBER, May 8, 1868.

"DEAR MR. BARNETT, — I have your note of the 5th in reference to the spelling of Alaska.

"I think 'Aliaska' is a mistake, for which the Coast Survey, in the first map of this country, are partly responsible. On inquiry, I found there was no particular

Another change should be made. As the settlements of this coast came eastward from Russia, bringing with the Russian flag Western time, the day is earlier by twenty-four hours with them than with us, so that their Sunday is our Saturday, and the other days of the week are in corresponding discord. This must be rectified according to the national meridian, so that there shall be the same Sunday for all, and the other days of the week shall be in corresponding harmony. Important changes must follow, of which this is typical. All else must be rectified according to the national meridian, so that within the sphere of our common country there shall be everywhere the same generous rule and one prevailing harmony. Of course, the unreformed Julian calendar, received from Russia, will give place to ours, — Old Style yielding to New Style.

authority for this spelling, and at my suggestion it was altered to *Alaska* in a subsequent edition.

"When called to consider the purchase of this territory, I found that it had the general name of 'Russian Possessions in America,' or 'Russian America.' In the event of transfer to the United States, this was evidently improper. Looking for a name, my attention was arrested by the designation of the promontory stretching to the Aleutian Islands, called by Captain Cook, the first Englishman who visited the region, *Alaska*, without an *i*, as the large and neighboring island was called *Oonalaska*. This is the first time, so far as I am aware, that the name appears. Though at a later day it was sometimes written 'Aliaska,' it seemed to me that the earlier designation was historically more just, while in itself a better word. On this account, at the close of my speech I ventured to propose it as a name for the whole country.

"While I was doing this in Washington, General Halleck, in San Francisco, was writing an elaborate letter to the Government about the new territory, in which he proposed the same name, with, as I understand, the same spelling.

"Yours truly,

"CHARLES SUMNER.

"HON. HIRAM BARNEY, New York."

A new edition of the map appeared with the pamphlet edition of the Speech, on which Mr. Hilgard, of the Coast Survey, in a letter dated May 25th, wrote to Mr. Sumner:—

"As this edition will make its first appearance appended to your speech, I have ventured to put on it the name *Alaska*, proposed by you, as I have no doubt it will be generally adopted."

An object of immediate practical interest will be the survey of the extended and indented coast by our own officers, bringing it all within the domain of science, and assuring to navigation much-needed assistance, while the Republic is honored by a continuation of national charts, where execution vies with science, and the art of engraving is the beautiful handmaid. Associated with this survey, and scarcely inferior in value, will be the examination of the country by scientific explorers, so that its geological structure may become known, with its various products, vegetable and mineral. But your best work and most important endowment will be the Republican Government, which, looking to a long future, you will organize, with schools free to all, and with equal laws, before which every citizen will stand erect in the consciousness of manhood. Here will be a motive power without which coal itself is insufficient. Here will be a source of wealth more inexhaustible than any fisheries. Bestow such a government, and you will give what is better than all you can receive, whether quintals of fish, sands of gold, choicest fur, or most beautiful ivory.

PRECAUTION AGAINST THE PRESIDENT.

REMARKS IN THE SENATE, ON A RESOLUTION ASKING FOR COPIES OF
OPINIONS WITH REGARD TO THE TENURE-OF-OFFICE LAW AND AP-
POINTMENTS DURING THE RECESS OF CONGRESS, APRIL 11, 1867.

MR. SUMNER moved the following resolution, and asked its immediate consideration :—

“Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to furnish to the Senate, if in his opinion not incompatible with the public interests, copies of any official opinions which may have been given by the Attorney-General, the Solicitor of the Treasury, or by any other officer of the Government, on the interpretation of the Act of Congress regulating the tenure of offices, and especially with regard to appointments by the President during the recess of Congress.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution. Mr. Sumner said :—

BEFORE the vote is taken, allow me to make a statement. I understand that opinions have been given by one or more officers of the Government which go far to nullify a recent Act of Congress. In short, it seems as if we are to have Nullification here in Washington in the Executive branch of the Government. According to these opinions, the President, I understand, is to exercise a power of appointment during the recess of Congress, notwithstanding the recent Act which undertakes to regulate the tenure of office.

We all know the astuteness of lawyers. It is a proverb. And it is sometimes said that a lawyer may drive a coach-and-six through an Act of Parliament, or even an Act of Congress. The Administration is now about to drive its coach-and-six through our recent legislation. In other words, it is about to force upon the country officers who cannot be officers according to existing law. It seems to me, that, before we adjourn, we should know the precise state of this question. We should understand if any such opinion has been given, and the reasons for it. It is on this account that I have introduced the resolution now before the Senate.

The resolution was adopted.

FINISH OUR WORK BEFORE ADJOURNMENT.

REMARKS IN THE SENATE, ON A MOTION TO ADJOURN WITHOUT DAY,
APRIL 11 AND 12, 1867.

ON the day after the adjournment of Congress the Senate was convened for the transaction of Executive business. Treaties and nominations were laid before it.

April 11th, on motion of Mr. Williams, of Oregon, the Senate considered a resolution for adjournment *sine die* "the 13th instant." Debate ensued. Mr. Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland, said: "We can fix the adjournment to-morrow or next day." Mr. Trumbull, of Illinois, said: "Let us fix it to-day." Mr. Sumner said:—

I DO not think we can fix it to-day, and, further, I do not think we ought to fix it to-day. It seems to me the calendar should be cleared before we talk of going home.

A Senator exclaims, "Wait until we get through." So I say. Senators are perfectly aware, that, owing to an interpretation recently put by the Executive upon the Tenure-of-Office Bill, there is an increased necessity for our staying. We have passed a law. We should see to its enforcement. At any rate, we should manifest coöperation with the Executive, so that there shall be no excuse for setting it aside. I do not admit that he can in any way set it aside; but I wish to do everything that can be done to prevent him from un-

dertaking to set it aside. We ought to stay until our work is fully done. There can be no excuse for going home while any part of the Executive business remains unfinished. Other Congresses have stayed here till mid-summer, and even into the month of September. If the necessities of the country require it, I see no reason why we should not stay till then.

April 12th, the subject was resumed, when Mr. Sumner said :—

I WILL say, that, just in proportion as we draw to the close of our business, we shall be better prepared to determine when we can adjourn finally. As we have not drawn to the close, I submit we are not in a condition to fix the day. That time may come; but I may remind the Senate that there is in Executive session unfinished business beyond what we had reason to expect. I say "reason to expect," because it is well known that there are many offices still unfilled; and it is our duty, before we leave, so far as it depends upon us, to see that they are filled.

We should stay, it seems to me, until the offices are filled, rejecting nominations that are bad and confirming the good,—doing, in short, all we can, as a Senate, to secure good officers, and I insist, also, officers on the right side, who agree with Congress, and will sustain the policy which Congress has declared.

The resolution was amended so as to make the adjournment 16th April, and then adopted,—Yeas 26, Nays 11,—Mr. Sumner voting in the negative. The time was afterwards extended, on motion of Mr. Sumner, to 20th April, when the Senate adjourned without day.

MEDIATION BETWEEN CONTENDING PARTIES IN MEXICO.

RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE, PROPOSING THE GOOD OFFICES OF THE
UNITED STATES, APRIL 20, 1867.

RESOLUTION proposing the good offices of the United States
between the contending parties of Mexico.

WHEREAS the Republic of Mexico, though relieved from the presence of a foreign enemy by the final withdrawal of the French troops, continues to be convulsed by a bloody civil war, in which Mexicans are ranged on opposite sides;

And whereas the United States are bound by neighborhood and republican sympathies to do all in their power for the welfare of the Mexican people, and this obligation becomes more urgent from the present condition of affairs, where each party is embittered by protracted conflict: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That it is proper for the Government of the United States, acting in the interest of humanity and civilization, to tender its good offices by way of mediation between the contending parties of the Republic of Mexico, in order to avert a deplorable civil war, and to obtain the establishment of republican government on a foundation of peace and security.

This was offered on the last day of the session. It was printed and laid on the table. Other resolutions on the same subject were offered by Mr. Henderson, of Missouri, and Mr. Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland.

EQUAL SUFFRAGE AT ONCE BY ACT OF CONGRESS RATHER THAN CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

LETTER TO THE NEW YORK INDEPENDENT, APRIL 20, 1867.

SENATE CHAMBER, April 20, 1867.

MY DEAR SIR,—You wish to have the North “reconstructed,” so at least that it shall cease to deny the elective franchise on account of color. But you postpone the day by insisting on the preliminary of a Constitutional Amendment. I know your vows to the good cause; but I ask you to make haste. We cannot wait.

Of course, we can always wait for the needful processes; but there are present reasons why we should allow no time to be lost. *This question must be settled forthwith*: in other words, it must be settled before the Presidential election, now at hand. Our colored fellow-citizens at the South are already electors. They will vote at the Presidential election. But why should they vote at the South, and not at the North? The rule of justice is the same for both. Their votes are needed at the North as well as the South. There are Northern States where their votes can make the good cause safe beyond question. There are other States where their votes will be like the last preponderant weight in the nicely balanced scales. Let our colored

fellow-citizens vote in Maryland, and that State, now so severely tried, will be fixed for Human Rights forever. Let them vote in Pennsylvania, and you will give more than twenty thousand votes to the Republican cause. Let them vote in New York, and the scales, which hang so doubtful, will incline to the Republican side. It will be the same in Connecticut. I mention these by way of example. But everywhere the old Proslavery party will kick the beam. Let all this be done, I say, before the next Presidential election.

Among the proposed ways is a new Constitutional Amendment. But this is too dilatory. It cannot become operative till after the Presidential election. Besides, it is needless. Instead of amending the Constitution, read it.

Another way is by moving each State, and obtaining through local legislation what is essentially *a right of citizenship*. But this again is too dilatory, while it turns each State into a political maelström, and submits a question of *National* interest to the chances of local controversy and the timidity of local politicians. This will not do. Emancipation was a National act, proceeding from the National Government, and applicable to all the States. Enfranchisement, which is the corollary and complement of Emancipation, must be a National act also, proceeding from the National Government, and applicable to all the States. If left to the States individually, the result, besides being tardy, will be uncertain and fragmentary.

There is another way, at once prompt, energetic, and comprehensive. It is by Act of Congress, adopted by a majority of two thirds, in spite of Presidential veto.

The time has passed when this power can be questioned. Congress has already exercised it in the Rebel States. I do not forget its hesitations. Only a year ago, when I insisted that it must do so, and introduced a bill to this effect, I was answered that a Constitutional Amendment was needed, and I was voted down. A change came, and in a happy moment Congress exercised the power. What patriot questions it now? But the power is unquestionable in the other States also. It concerns the rights of citizenship, and this subject is as essentially national as the army or the navy.

Even without either of the recent Constitutional Amendments, I am at a loss to understand how a denial of the elective franchise simply on account of color can be otherwise than unconstitutional. I cannot see how, under a National Constitution which does not contain the word "white" or "black," there can be any exclusion on account of color. There is no such exclusion in the Constitution. Out of what text is this oligarchical pretension derived? But, putting aside this question, which will be clearer to the jurists of the next generation than to us, I vouch the authoritative words of the National Constitution, making it our duty to guaranty a republican form of government in the States. Now the greatest victory of the war, to which all other victories, whether in Congress or on the bloody field, were only tributary, was the definition of a republican government according to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. A government which denies the elective franchise on account of color, or, in other words, sets up any "qualifications" of voters in their nature insurmountable, cannot be re-

publican ; for the first principle in a republican government is Equality of Rights, according to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. And this definition, I insist, is the crowning glory of the war which beat down Rebellion under its feet. It only remains for Congress to enforce it by appropriate legislation.

There are two recent Constitutional Amendments, each of which furnishes ample and cumulative power.

There is, first, the Amendment abolishing Slavery, with its clause conferring on Congress the power to enforce it by appropriate legislation, in pursuance of which Congress has already passed the Civil Rights Act, which is applicable to the North as well as the South. Clearly, and most obviously beyond all question, if it can pass a Civil Rights Act, it can also pass a Political Rights Act ; for each is appropriate to enforce the abolition of Slavery, and to complete this work. Without it the work is only half done.

There is yet another Amendment, recently adopted by three fourths of the loyal States, which is itself an abundant source of power. After declaring that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are "citizens," this Amendment proceeds to provide that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of *citizens* of the United States"; and Congress is empowered to enforce this provision by appropriate legislation. Nothing can be plainer than this.

Here, then, are three different sources of power in the Constitution itself, each sufficient, the three together three times sufficient, — each exuberant and overflowing, the three together three times exuberant and overflowing. How, in the face of these provisions, any

person can doubt the power of Congress I cannot understand. But, alas! there are doubters always.

I have already sent you a copy of my bill to settle this question by what I call "the short cut." Give us your vote. Of course, you will. Believe me, my dear Sir,

Very faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

THEODORE TILTON, Esq.

This was followed by an editorial article sustaining and vindicating Mr. Sumner's bill. It began:—

"Yes. Mr. Sumner has our vote. He has always had it; he is always likely to have it. 'How did Roger Sherman vote?' asked our forefathers. They believed it was safe to vote with Roger Sherman. It is just as safe to vote with Charles Sumner."

After explanation and argument, the article proceeds:—

"Not only is Mr. Sumner right as to the power of Congress in the present case, but long ago he was right as to the power of Congress to govern the unconstitutional States as conquered provinces. He then stood almost alone in the Senate in an opinion which he has since seen adopted by his brother Senators. We trust his compeers will agree to his present bill. We happen to know that Thaddeus Stevens—who, even when sick, is more well than most men—is preparing, on his sick-bed, an argument in support of Mr. Sumner's plan. We happen to know, also, that Chief Justice Chase agrees with Mr. Sumner's view."

CELEBRATION AT ARLINGTON, ON ASSUMING ITS NEW NAME.

SPEECH AT A DINNER IN A TENT, JUNE 17, 1867.

WEST CAMBRIDGE, originally part of Cambridge, Massachusetts, assumed the name of Arlington, with the consent of the Legislature. The change was celebrated in the town by a public dinner in a tent.

MR. PRESIDENT AND FELLOW-CITIZENS OF ARLINGTON:—

IN looking around me on this beautiful scene of hospitality, I am reminded of that doge of Genoa, who, finding himself amid the splendors of Versailles, in its incomparable palace, and being asked what about him caused the most surprise, replied, "To find myself here." And so to me, coming from other scenes, and for many years absolutely unused to such occasions, this spectacle is strange. But it is not less welcome because strange.

Coming here to take part in this interesting celebration, I am not insensible to the kindness of good friends among you, through whom the invitation was received. But I confess a neighborly interest in your festival. Born in Boston, and educated in Cambridge, I am one of your neighbors. Accept, then, if you please, the sympathies of a neighbor on this occasion.

Yours is not a large town; nor has it any extended

history. But what it wants in size and history it makes up in beauty. Yours is a beautiful town. I know nothing among the exquisite surroundings of Boston more charming than these slopes and meadows, with background of hills and gleam of water. The elements of beauty are all here. Hills are always beautiful; so is water. I remember hearing a woman of genius, Mrs. Fanny Kemble, say more than once, that water in a landscape is "like eyes in the human countenance," without which the countenance is lifeless. But water gleams, shines, sparkles in your landscape. Here the water-nymphs might find a home. Gardens, beautiful to the eye and bountiful in nourishing and luscious supplies, are also yours. Surely it may be said of those who live here, that their lines have fallen in a pleasant place.

I go too far, when I suggest that you are without a history. West Cambridge was part of that historic Cambridge so early famous in our country, the seat of learning and the home of patriotism. The honor of Cambridge is yours. West Cambridge adjoins Lexington, and was in the war-path of the British soldiers on that 19th of April, which, perhaps, as much as any day after the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers, determined the fortunes of this continent. The shots of Concord and Lexington were heard here before their echoes began the tour of the globe. Shots from here followed, and your beautiful fields bore testimony in blood. The road from Concord was a prolonged battleground, on which British troops fell; there were patriots, also, who fell.

Then came the Battle of Bunker Hill, on the very day we now celebrate, followed soon by the arrival of

Washington, who, on the 3d day of July, 1775, drew his sword as Commander-in-Chief under the well-known elm of Cambridge Common. Do not forget that you were of Cambridge then. The first duty of the new commander-in-chief was to inspect his forces. The mass of the British army, amounting to 11,500 men, occupied Bunker Hill and Boston Neck, while their general with his light horse was in Boston. The Patriot forces, amounting to about 16,000 men, were so posted as to form a complete line around Boston and Charlestown, from Mystic River to Dorchester, nearly twelve miles in circuit. Regiments from New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Connecticut occupied Winter Hill and Prospect Hill, where it is easy still to recognize their earthworks; several of the Massachusetts regiments were at Cambridge; and others from Connecticut and Massachusetts covered the high grounds of Roxbury. This was the Siege of Boston. With all these preparations, Washington was still provident of the future. And here commences an association with the hills about your town, which must be my justification for these details.

Many years ago, when I first read the account of this period by one of the early biographers of Washington, Rev. Dr. Bancroft, of Worcester, the father of our distinguished historian, I was struck by the statement, which I quote in his precise words, that, "in case of an attack and defeat, the *Welsh Mountains in Cambridge*, and the rear of the lines in Roxbury, were appointed as places of rendezvous."¹ Perhaps this association, and even the name of the mountains, may be new to some whom I have the honor of addressing. "The Welsh Mountains" are the hills which skirt your peaceful val-

¹ Bancroft's Life of Washington (Worcester, 1807), p. 47.

ley. Since then I have never looked upon them, even at a distance, I have never thought of them, without feeling that they are monumental. They testify to that perfect prudence which made our commander-in-chief so great. In those hours when undisciplined patriots were preparing for conflict with the trained soldiers of England, the careful eye of Washington, calmly surveying the whole horizon, selected your hills as the breastworks behind which he was to retrieve the day. The hills still stand firm and everlasting as when he looked upon them, but smiling now with fertility and peace. They will never be needed as breastworks. There is no enemy encamped in Boston and ready to sally forth for battle; nor is there any siege.

But you will allow me to remind you that the ideas of the Revolution and the solemn promises of the Declaration of Independence are still debated. There are some who have the hardihood to deny them. Here I venture to bespeak from you the simple loyalty of those whose places you occupy. Should an evil hour arrive, when these ideas and promises are in peril, then let them find a breastwork, not in your hills, but in your hearts. And may the rally extend until it embraces the whole country, and the Revolution begun by our fathers is completed by the establishment of all the rights of all!

POWERS OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS IN THE ABSENCE OF A QUORUM.

PROTEST IN THE SENATE, AT ITS OPENING, JULY 3, 1867.

JULY 3d, according to the provision in the resolution of adjournment at the last session, Congress met at noon this day. The Chief Clerk read the resolution.¹ Mr. Sumner then said that he rose to a question of order on the resolution.

THE resolution under which Congress is to-day assembled, so far as it undertakes to direct the adjournment of the two Houses of Congress without day, in the absence of a quorum of the two Houses, is unconstitutional and inoperative, inasmuch as the Constitution, after declaring that "a majority of each House shall constitute a quorum to do business," proceeds to provide that "a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent members"; and therefore such resolution must not be regarded by the Chair, so far as it undertakes to provide for an adjournment without day.

As, according to the view, there is a quorum already present, the incident contemplated by the resolution

¹ *Ante*, Vol. XIV. p. 355.

will not arise; but I felt it my duty, by way of precaution and *caveat*, to introduce this protest, to the end that the resolution may not hereafter be drawn into a precedent so as to abridge the rights of the two Houses of Congress under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Trumbull, of Illinois, differed from Mr. Sumner, and entered his "protest against any such construction of the Constitution as denies to the two Houses of Congress the right to regulate their own adjournments." After quoting the text of the Constitution, that "a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business, but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent members," Mr. Sumner said:—

HERE is a concurrent resolution providing for a future meeting of Congress. To that extent it is unquestionably constitutional; but when the resolution imposes shackles upon the two Houses of Congress assembled by virtue of that resolution, then, I submit, it does what, under the National Constitution, it cannot do,—its words are powerless. Congress, when once assembled by virtue of that resolution, has all the powers of a Congress of the United States under the Constitution. That resolution cannot restrain it. Such, at any rate, is my conclusion, after the best reflection that I have been able to give to these words of the Constitution; and I feel it my duty to make this protest, to the end that what we now do may not be drawn into an example hereafter. It is well known that those words were introduced in order to tie the hands of Congress, should it come together and there be no quorum present,—in short, to despoil the Congress then assembled of the prerogative secured to it by the National Constitution. To that

extent I suggest that the resolution hereafter shall be regarded as of no value, and not be quoted as a precedent.

After reply from Mr. Trumbull, the subject was dropped.

HOMESTEADS FOR FREEDMEN.

RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE, JULY 3, 1867.

RESOLVED, That the reconstruction of the Rebel States would be hastened, and the best interest of the country promoted, if the President of the United States, in the exercise of the pardoning power, would require that every landed proprietor who has been engaged in the Rebellion, before receiving pardon therefor, should convey to the freedmen, his former slaves, a certain portion of the land on which they have worked, so that they may have a homestead in which their own labor has mingled, and that the disloyal master may not continue to appropriate to himself the fruits of their toil.

On motion of Mr. Sumner, this was printed and laid on the table. The rule limiting business during the present session prevented him from calling it up.

LIMITATION OF THE BUSINESS OF THE SENATE.

OBLIGATIONS OF SENATE CAUCUSES.

SPEECHES IN THE SENATE, JULY 3, 5, AND 10, 1867.

MR. SUMNER had looked to this session not only for precautions against the President, but for legislation on Suffrage. He had never doubted that there would be a session. March 30th, just before the final adjournment, he gave notice that on the first Wednesday of July he should ask the Senate to proceed with his bill to secure the elective franchise to colored citizens, when Mr. Sherman, of Ohio, said, "The Senator had better add, 'or some subsequent day.'" [*Laughter.*] Mr. Sumner said: "I beg the Senate to take notice that there will be a session on the first Wednesday of July, to proceed with business. I have reason to believe that there will be a quorum here, for there will be important public business that must be attended to."

On the completion of the organization, Mr. Sumner proceeded to offer petitions, when he was interrupted by Mr. Fessenden, of Maine, who said: "I desire to interpose an objection to the reference of these petitions; and I may as well bring the question up here now, before the Senator offers any more. I do it for the reason that in my judgment it is not expedient at the present session to act upon general business"; and he referred to the course at the session of the Twenty-Seventh Congress, called by President Harrison. Mr. Sumner said, in reply:—

MR. PRESIDENT, — We are a Congress of the United States, assembled under the National Constitution, and with all the powers belonging to Congress,—ay, Sir, and with all the responsibilities also. We cannot, by agreement or understanding, divest ourselves of these

responsibilities, being nothing less than to transact the public business, — not simply one item or two items, but the public business in its sum total, whatever it may be, — in one word, all that concerns the welfare of this great Republic. Now the Senator limits us to one item, which he has only alluded to, without characterizing. I suppose I understand him; but he must know well that even that business has many ramifications. But why are we to be restricted thus? Looking at past usage, I need not remind you that we have habitually sat throughout the summer into the month of August, and on one occasion into the month of September. It is no new thing that Congress should be here in July. It is an exception that Congress is not here in July, during every alternate year. Therefore, in considering public business, even under these heats, we are only doing what our predecessors before us have done; we are following the usage of Congress, and not setting up a new usage of our own. The motion of the Senator, if it be a motion, or rather his suggestion, does set up a new usage. It is virtually to declare, that, when admonished by the heats of July, we will fold our hands, and will not even consider public business, except in one particular case; that all the other vast interests of this country will be left, without reference to a committee, without inquiry, unattended to, neglected.

The Senator from Maine says, that, when Congress adjourned at the end of March, it was not supposed that there would be a session at this time. He may not have supposed there would be a session. I never doubted that there would be one. I saw full well that the public interests would require a session in July, and I labored to bring it about, feeling that in so doing I was

only discharging a public duty. Do you forget whom you have as President? A constant disturber, and a mischief-maker. So long as his administration continues, it is the duty of Congress to be on guard, perpetually on watch against him; and this must have been obvious when Congress adjourned, as it is obvious now. Senators may not have foreseen precisely what he would do; but I take it that there were few who did not foresee that he would do something making it important for Congress to be present. I did not doubt, then, that it would be our duty to be here in our places to make adequate provision against his misdeeds. He is President, and the head of the Executive, invested with all the powers belonging to that department. It is hard, I know, to provide against him; but nevertheless you must do it. This Republic is too great, too vast, and too precious, to be left in the hands of a bad man.

One of the greatest masters in the art of war tells us, as the lesson of his great military experience, that the good general always regards that as probable which is possible. I know no better rule for the statesman. Now, with a President such as we have, anything in the nature of disturbance or interference with the public security is possible through the Executive arm. Therefore you are to regard it as probable, and make provision against it. So I argued last spring, and was satisfied that it would be our duty to be in our seats at the coming July. We are here, and I now insist that it is our duty to go forward and discharge all our duties, without exception, under the National Constitution.

Mr. Fessenden replied, referring to the proceedings at the called session of the Twenty-Seventh Congress on resolutions of Mr. Clay to limit business. Mr. Sumner rejoined:—

I HOPE the Senate will pardon me, if I add one word to what I have already said. The Senator from Maine introduces as a precedent something which he will pardon me if I say is not a precedent. He calls our attention to a session of Congress convened by virtue of a summons of the President, being a called session. Why, Sir, this is no called session. This is simply a continuing session, begun on the 4th day of March. It is not a new session. It is a session already begun, prolonged by adjournment into the midst of July. Were it such a session as the Senator from Maine seems to imagine, his precedent might be applicable. We might then search the message of the President to find the subjects proper for consideration. It is, however, no such session. We are here broadly, under all our powers as a Congress, our life as a Congress having begun here on the 4th day of March at noon. Therefore, allow me to say, the precedent is inapplicable.

The practical question, then, is, What shall we do, being a Congress assembled as any other Congress, with all powers and all duties? I submit, proceed with the public business in due order, until such time as by the reports of committees or by votes of the two bodies we shall be satisfied that it is not advisable to proceed further. I think, therefore, petitions should be presented and referred, bills introduced and take their proper destinations, and business of all kinds be brought before the Senate.

At the suggestion of Senators, the petitions were laid on the table to await formal action on the question.

July 5th, Mr. Anthony, of Rhode Island, moved the following resolution, which had been agreed upon in a caucus of Republican Senators:—

“Resolved, That the legislative business of this session be confined to removing the obstructions which have been or are likely to be placed in the way of the fair execution of the Acts of Reconstruction heretofore adopted by Congress, and to giving to said Acts the scope intended by Congress when the same were passed; and that further legislation, at this session, on the subject of Reconstruction, or on other subjects, is not expedient.”

Mr. Sumner at once appealed to Mr. Anthony :—

BEFORE a resolution of such importance, so open to criticism, so doubtful in point of order, so plainly contrary to the spirit of the Constitution, is brought under consideration, I do think that the Senator who brings it forward should enlighten us in regard to its object, and the reasons in justification of so extraordinary a proposition.

Mr. Anthony made a brief statement, in which he said that he “supposed the reason for this proposition was so evident to every Senator who has conversed with the members of the body, that it would require no explanation whatever”; that “the public sentiment of the country demanded that there should be some legislation in order to make the Reconstruction Acts precisely what we intended them to be, and not as they have been construed.” Mr. Sumner then moved the following substitute :—

“That the Senate will proceed, under its rules, to the despatch of the public business requiring attention, and to this end all petitions and bills will be referred for consideration to the appropriate committees, without undertaking in advance to limit the action of Congress to any special subject, and to deny a hearing on all other subjects.”

He then remarked :—

I OBJECT to the proposition of my friend from Rhode Island, which I cannot but think he has introduced hastily and without sufficient consideration, or at any rate under influences which I think his own better judgment should have rejected. I am against it on several grounds. If I said it was contrary to precedent, I should not err; for the attempt made the other

day to show that there was precedent for such a proceeding, it seems to me, signally failed. Attention was then called to a resolution adopted at a session of Congress convened by the President of the United States for a declared purpose, announced at the time in advance. I think the course taken by Congress was regarded as questionable, even under the peculiar circumstances. But the two cases are different. The present session is not like that. It is a continuing session of a Congress begun on the 4th day of March last, being simply a prolongation of that session; and the practical question is, whether you will limit the business of Congress in a general session called under a statute of the United States. Clearly there is no precedent for any such proceeding. You plunge into darkness without a guide.

But I go further, and I say, that, even if there were a precedent, I would reject it; for I much prefer to follow the National Constitution. I do not say that the text of the Constitution positively forbids the proposition, but I cannot doubt that the spirit of the Constitution is against it. How often, in other times, have we all throbbed with indignation at the resolution in the other House, also in this Chamber, to stifle discussion on a great question! You do not forget the odious rule by the name of the "Gag," attached to which was the name of its author, beginning with the letter A.¹ I hope there will be no other gag of a larger character to be classified with the letter A. That was justly

¹ Hon. Charles G. Atherton, Representative from New Hampshire, — author of the resolutions of December 11, 1838, on which was based the notorious 21st Rule of the House, providing that "No petition, memorial, resolution, or other paper, praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia or any State or Territory, or the slave-trade between the States or Territories of the United States in which it now exists, shall be received by this House, or entertained in any way whatever."

offensive, because it violated the right of petition; but you propose not only to interfere with the right of petition, but also with all possible measures concerning the public welfare, except as they may relate to one single business, and that in its narrowest relations.

I object to such a proposition as in its spirit unconstitutional. I appeal to my associates to reject it, that it may not pass into history as a precedent of evil example to be employed against Freedom. You may see, Sir, how obstructive it is, if you will glance at certain matters within my own knowledge, which, I submit, it is our duty to consider, and my duty as a Senator to press upon your attention. No relations with political associates can absolve me from official responsibility.

Every Senator, doubtless, has within his own knowledge business which in his judgment deserves attention, and other business which he does not doubt must be acted on. There are Senators on the other side of the Chamber who will plead the cause of the frontiers menaced by the Indians. I have heard something of that peril from chance travellers during these few weeks past; and yet, by the proposition of my friend from Rhode Island, we are to abandon the frontiers, and I know no other reason than that the weather is too hot. It may be hot in this Chamber; but it is hotter there. The reports from the frontier show that danger has begun. The sound of the war-whoop has broken even into this Capitol. The corpses of fellow-countrymen lie unburied on the roadside, and their memories haunt us. And yet we fold our hands, and decline to supply the needed protection.

Mr. Sumner then alluded to the necessity of legislation to carry out a recent treaty with Venezuela, and also the treaty with Russia.

I mean that important treaty by which the Emperor of Russia has ceded to the United States all his possessions on the North American continent. The ratifications were exchanged only about a fortnight ago. Yesterday, the 4th of July, I was honored by a visit from the Minister of Russia, who put into my hand a cable despatch from St. Petersburg, announcing that on the day before the Russian Commissioner left St. Petersburg for Washington to make the formal surrender of that vast region to the United States. To my inquiry when the Commissioner would arrive the Minister replied, "In a fortnight." In a fortnight, then, final proceedings will be had for the establishment of your jurisdiction over that region, and two questions arise: first, our duty to complete the contract, in consideration of the cession, to pay \$7,200,000; and, secondly, our other duty to provide a proper government. But the proposition of my friend from Rhode Island would exclude these important topics from our consideration.

MR. ANTHONY. Would the Senator have the Senate originate an appropriation bill?

MR. SUMNER. I would have the Senate originate a bill for the government of this territory, and, if need be, originate a bill for the payment of the money due. There is no objection in the Constitution.

MR. ANTHONY. It has never been done.

MR. SUMNER. I beg the Senator's pardon; it has been done again and again.

MR. ANTHONY. An appropriation bill originated in the Senate?

MR. SUMNER. Oh, yes.

MR. ANTHONY. I never knew that to be done but once; and then the House rejected it, refused to consider it.

MR. SUMNER. The Senator refers to what are called the general appropriation bills. The Senate constantly makes appropriations for individual cases and for carrying out treaties. Does it not appropriate for private claims, for salaries, for other obligations? In principle, the present case does not differ from an appropriation for an estate adjoining the Capitol. Alaska is not an estate adjoining the Capitol; but it is to be paid for.

That I may make this clearer, I call attention to the very words of the treaty with Russia:—

“His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias shall appoint with convenient despatch an agent or agents for the purpose of formally delivering to a similar agent or agents appointed on behalf of the United States the territory, dominion, property, dependencies, and appurtenances which are ceded as above, and for doing any other act which may be necessary in regard thereto. But the cession, with the right of immediate possession, is nevertheless to be deemed complete and absolute on the exchange of ratifications, without waiting for such formal delivery.”¹

So that, by the terms of the treaty, on the exchange of ratifications you became possessors of this jurisdiction; and now, by the approaching surrender, through an official agent, your jurisdiction will be consummated. With this jurisdiction will be corresponding responsibilities. You must govern the territory; you must provide protection for the property and the other interests there. Already, by the telegraph, we learn that a large ship is about to leave San Francisco for Sitka, with merchandise of all kinds. There is also the immense fur-trade, which has been the exclusive Russian inter-

¹ Article IV.: United States Statutes at Large, Vol. XV. p. 542.

est ever since the discovery of the country, which will be left open, without regulation, unless you interfere by appropriate law. There is that most important fur, the origin of wealth on that whole northwestern coast, the sea-otter, which will be exposed to lawless and destructive depredation, unless the Government supplies some regulations. Will you not do something? Will you leave these interests without care?

Senators exclaim, that they may be considered next winter. Do not forget the distance between Washington and that far-away region; you will then see how long you postpone the establishment of your jurisdiction. Months must elapse after the meeting of Congress next December, leaving this region without government. There should be no delay; you should proceed at once. You certainly will not show yourselves worthy to possess this country, unless you provide at once a proper government. Leaving it a prey to lawless adventure, you will only increase the difficulties of dealing with a region so vast and so remote.

But there is another obligation still. You receive the territory; you ought to pay the money at the same time. A Senator before me cries out, "It will not be appropriated at this session."

MR. EDMUNDS. It is not due yet.

MR. SUMNER. I ask the Senator's attention to the point. I understand, as a matter of history, in this negotiation, that, while it was proceeding, it was proposed that the payment should be on the exchange of ratifications, so that, when the cession was completed, the transaction on our part should be completed also; but as the treaty was being drawn, it was understood

that there would be no meeting of Congress before next December, while the ratifications might be exchanged before that time. To meet this case, a special provision was introduced, extending the time of payment to a period of ten months from the exchange of ratifications. This explains the article I now read:—

“In consideration of the cession aforesaid, the United States agree to pay at the Treasury in Washington, within ten months after the exchange of the ratifications of this convention, to the diplomatic representative or other agent of His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, duly authorized to receive the same, seven million two hundred thousand dollars in gold.”¹

By the letter of the treaty, you may, if you see fit, postpone the payment to ten months from the exchange of ratifications; but I submit to the Senator from Vermont, whether he is willing to do so,—whether, since the transaction is consummated on the part of Russia, he is not willing, nay, desirous also, that it shall be consummated on the part of the United States in the spirit of the original negotiation? I submit this as a question of sound policy,—I will not say of integrity, but simply of sound policy on the part of our Government, a republic representing republican institutions, by whose conduct republican institutions are always judged. Surely you will not fail to protect the national honor; nor will you stick at the letter of the treaty.

I have alluded to two important matters under treaties; but there is still another, more important than any treaty or any appropriation, which dwarfs treaties and

¹ Article VI.

dwarfs appropriations, which is not less important, certainly, than the protection of the frontier, now menaced by Indians. I refer to a whole region of our Republic, embracing two extensive States, now menaced by a foe more dangerous to the national peace and welfare than any tribe of Indians. These are returning Rebels in the States of Kentucky and Maryland. Provide against them. They are Indians within your jurisdiction. You have the power; you have the means. Give the ballot to the colored citizens in those States, as you have given it already to colored citizens in the Rebel States, and you will have an all-sufficient protection against these intruders. Here is something to be done. Who doubts the power? Out of three fountains in the Constitution it may be derived. It is your duty, then, to exercise it. See to it that these States have a republican government. Fix in your statute-book an authoritative definition of a republic. Enforce the two Amendments of the Constitution,—one abolishing Slavery, and the other declaring the rights of citizens. Any delay to exercise so clear a power is a failure of duty; and it becomes more reprehensible, when we consider the perils that may ensue. Communicate, if you please, with Union citizens of those two States. Listen to what they say. Be taught by their testimony.

I have, for instance, a letter from an eminent citizen of Maryland, written from Baltimore the 1st of July, which concludes:—

“I will only add, that the interest felt by the loyal people of this State in the passage of this bill cannot be overstated.”

Communicate with your late colleague upon this floor, that able and patriotic Senator, Mr. Creswell.

Listen to his testimony. There can be no doubt that Unionists, whether black or white, in Maryland, require your protection. Give it to them. Do not leave them a prey to Rebels. In the same way they are exposed in Kentucky. Here is a letter from a distinguished citizen of that State, dated July 1st: and I read these, out of many others, simply because they are the latest; they have come within a few hours:—

“I hope you will be able to do good at the extra session, and extend and protect the rights of the freedmen, as they are sadly in need of it in Kentucky. Reconstruct us; this is the only loyal hope.”

Such is the cry. Kentucky needs reconstruction, and it is your duty to provide it. Put her on an equality with the Rebel States. Let her colored citizens enjoy the full-blown rights of citizens, and let the white Unionists there have the protection of their votes. You sent muskets once; send votes now.¹

¹ The allusion to Kentucky drew from Mr. Davis, of that State, some days later, a vehement Philippic, where, among other things, he said: “The Senator from Massachusetts himself has been complicated in the crime of treason” (alluding to his opposition to the Fugitive Slave Bill). . . . “Massachusetts now is in high feather. Why? She feels conscious and proud that the Constitution of the United States is prostrate at her feet, and that she is leading the whole Radical host of America to execute her wild, oppressive, and unconstitutional behests. . . . The Senator from Massachusetts pretends to be a statesman, and gets up to speak in this Chamber, not only to the Senate, not only to the people of the United States, but to the legislators and statesmen and publicists of Europe, . . . as if he fancied himself the autocratic lawgiver of the whole land,—as though he was a great Colossus in wisdom and power, bestriding Government, Constitution, and country. . . . The people of the South are enslaved; they are enslaved by the usurped power of the Senator from Massachusetts, in part, and he knows it. . . . If justice could overtake the States of this Union, Massachusetts would be reconstructed and brought to greater shame than even South Carolina. The honorable Senator was almost in an ecstasy, a few days ago, when he foretold the advent of

On your table is a bill "to enforce the several provisions of the Constitution abolishing Slavery, declaring the immunities of citizens, and guarantying a republican form of government by securing the elective franchise to colored citizens." Pass this bill, and you furnish the needed protection in these semi-rebel States. Pass this bill, and you supersede strife on this much-vexed and disturbing question in other States of the Union. You at once bring to the elective franchise thousands of good citizens, pledged by their lives and inspired by their recently received rights to sustain the good cause which you have so much at heart. Do this; help in this way the final settlement of the national troubles; pass this bill of peace,—for such it will be, giving repose in all the Northern States,—and in this way help establish repose in all the rest of the country. And yet I am told that even this important measure is to be set aside. We are not to enter upon its consideration; we are not to debate it; we are not to receive petitions in its favor. Is this right? Is it not a neglect of duty? Is it not intolerable?

Mr. President, on these grounds I object to this proposition. I might have objected to it, in the first place, as out of order, and asked the ruling of the Chair, not doubting how the Chair, inspired always by a generous love of human rights, must rule,—not doubting that the Chair would say that a proposition of such a char-

negro Senators into this body. He was jubilant. . . . We see the fell purpose of the honorable Senator from Massachusetts. We know with what persistence he pursues his objects" Mr. Sumner, in reply, simply read extracts from speeches by Judge Goodloe, Willard Davis, G. H. Graham, and General Brisbin, all of Kentucky, at a recent celebration, on the 4th of July, at Lexington, in that State.¹

¹ Congressional Globe, 40th Cong. 1st Sess., July 13, 1867, pp. 631-633.

acter was too closely associated with one of the most odious measures of our history to deserve welcome at this time. I have raised no such question. I confine myself now to other objections. I object to it as a departure from sound usage, as contrary to the spirit of the Constitution, and as setting up an impediment and obstruction to the transaction of public business of an urgent character, which you cannot neglect without neglect of duty. I ask you to provide for the execution of recent treaties with Venezuela and Russia, to assure protection to Unionists in Maryland and Kentucky, and to give peace to the country. Above all, do not make a bad precedent, to be quoted hereafter to the injury of the Republic.

Mr. Pomeroy, of Kansas, felt "embarrassed in voting against the resolution offered by the Senator from Rhode Island," but he thought it "impracticable and unwise," that it would "subject us to censure, and that we ourselves should regret it hereafter." Mr. Yates, of Illinois, "was for a special session for a special purpose." In reply to a question of Mr. Yates, Mr. Sumner said :—

I do not believe Congress would have come together, if they had had faith in the President. I believe the session beginning on the 4th of March had its origin in want of confidence in the President. I believe my friend agrees in that.

MR. YATES. Yes.

MR. SUMNER. It was to counteract and watch the President that Congress met on the 4th of March. When this session was about to adjourn, provision was made for its renewal, or a continuation or a prolongation of it, if you may so regard it. I take it in the same spirit with the original enactment.

It was to provide against the President, and to do such other incidental business as the public interests might require. I never doubted that there would be a session on the 3d of July.¹ I so stated at the passage of the resolution. I have so stated constantly since; and I have advised more than one gentleman connected with Congress not to leave the country, because his post of duty was here. I believe that I have answered the question of my friend.

And now one word more. We are assembled under an Act of Congress and the National Constitution. By the Constitution it is provided that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." That is all it can do. It may not annihilate proceedings; it may not forbid proceedings. It may provide rules for them; but it cannot, in a just sense, prevent. Therefore I submit that the resolution, if not positively unconstitutional, is contrary to the spirit of that instrument.

Mr. Ross, of Kansas, hoped "that either the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts or something similar to it would carry." Mr. Tipton, of Nebraska, was "embarrassed in regard to voting for the original resolution." After further debate, the vote was taken on Mr. Sumner's substitute, and it was rejected, — Yeas 6, Nays 26.

Mr. Ross then moved a substitute limiting business "to removing the obstructions which have been or are likely to be placed in the way of the fair execution of the Acts of Reconstruction," and "such as may be rendered necessary for the preservation of the peace on the Western frontier." Debate ensued, in which Mr. Howe, of Wisconsin, said: "I did not suppose any gentleman would insist that I was bound by the decision of that body, or by the conclusion arrived at in that consultation. . . . I do not know what penalties I subject myself to by disagreeing here and now with the conclusions then arrived at." Mr. Wade, of Ohio, spoke vigorously against the original resolution. In his judgment, "there are some questions about which a Senator has no right to conform his view to that of the majority," and he took the orig-

¹ See, *ante*, p. 190.

inal resolution to be of that class. "It sets a precedent of the greatest danger in high party times." He hoped "that no such detriment to a minority will ever be successfully urged here." He judged Mr. Sumner's "measure, which is to give universal suffrage by Act of Congress, to be upon the subject of Reconstruction, and one of the most efficient measures to that end; and yet gentlemen seem to suppose that that is within the scope of the excluding clause of this resolution." Mr. Fessenden was equally positive the other way. He referred to the caucus of Republican Senators where the original resolution was prepared, which he deemed "eminently proper." "When gentlemen go into consultation with their friends, and make no protest whatever against having the result of that consultation acted upon, they agree impliedly and expressly, in my judgment, that they will be bound on that subject by the decision which their friends come to, unless they give notice to the contrary, — that is to say, in case they continue to act on the subject to the end." Mr. Sumner followed.

MR. PRESIDENT, — I should not have said another word, but for topics introduced by the Senator from Maine; yet before I allude to those particularly, allow me to answer his argument, so far as I am able to appreciate it. He will pardon me for saying that he confounds right and power. Unquestionably the Senate has the power which he attributes to it; but it has not the right. A jury, as we know, in giving a general verdict, has power to say "Guilty" or "Not guilty," disregarding the instructions of the court; but I need not say that it is a grave question among lawyers whether it has the right. Now, assuming that the Senate has the power which the Senator from Maine claims, it seems to me it has not the right. It has not the right to disregard the spirit of the National Constitution; and the present proposition is of that character. The Senator does not see it so, I know; for, if he did, he could not give to it the weight of his character. Others do see it so; and if they do, the Senator from Maine must par-

don them, if they act accordingly. The Senator would not vote for anything he regarded as hostile to the spirit of the Constitution. I cannot attribute to him any such conduct. Can he expect others to do what he would not do himself? This is my answer to the argument, so far as I understand it. Perhaps I do not do justice to it; yet I try.

There was one other point of argument. The Senate, so the Senator argues, may postpone an individual measure to the next session. Grant it; does it follow that they may postpone, immediately on their arrival, the whole business to another session?

MR. FESSENDEN. They can adjourn on the next day, or on the day they meet, if they please.

MR. SUMNER. But so long as they continue in session as a Senate, then, under the National Constitution, they must attend to the business of the country. They cannot tie their hands in advance. To do so is to violate the spirit of the Constitution. The Senator cannot have forgotten the Atherton gag, to which I referred before, without naming it, however. Was it not justly an offence and a stench in the nostrils of every patriot citizen? Has it not left a bad name upon the Congresses that recognized it? But this was simply a declaration not to receive petitions on one subject; and now, under the lead of the Senator, we are to continue in session an indefinite time, and to receive no petition, no bill, nothing on anything except on one specified subject. I submit, if the Atherton gag was unconstitutional, if it was odious, if it was a bad precedent, then you are very rash in establishing this much broader precedent. Do not condemn the offensive legis-

lation of the past ; do not condemn those slave-masters once so offensive in these Chambers. You go further than they. You impose a gag not upon petitions merely, but upon the general business of the country.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. WADE] has, with unanswerable force, depicted the offensive character of this precedent, and he has taught us how, now that we are a majority, we should hesitate to set such an example for the future. How should we feel, he has aptly reminded us, if, as a minority, we had such a cup handed to our lips by a patriot Senator? Doubtless, that for the time patriotism had departed.

I should not have been betrayed into these remarks now, but for topics introduced by the Senator from Maine. When I opened this debate, this morning, Senators will bear me witness, I made no allusion to any discussion elsewhere. I did not think a caucus a proper subject for this Chamber ; nor did I attribute to it anything of the character which the Senator from Maine does. He makes it not merely sacred, but a *sacro-sanct pact*, by which every one at the meeting is solemnly bound. What authority is there for any such conclusion? Senators went to that caucus, I presume, like myself, without knowing what was to be considered ; and let me confess, when the proposition, in its first form, was presented, I was startled by its offensive character. I could not believe that a Senator, knowing the responsibilities and duties of a Senator, and under the oath of a Senator, could start such a thing. Well, Sir, discussion went on. The proposition ~~was~~ amended, modified, mitigated, losing something of its offensiveness in form, but it still remained substantially offensive. I am not aware that any Senator

suggested that it should be adopted as a rule of the Senate. If any one did, I did not hear it, though paying close attention to the discussion. I do not think the Senator from Maine made any such suggestion. I certainly never supposed that anybody would propose such a rule. So far as it was to have any value, I supposed it was to be the recorded result of the deliberations of political associates,—so far as practicable, a guide for their action, but not a constraint embodied in a perpetual record. At the last moment, after the vote had been declared to which the Senator from Maine refers, and to which I should make no allusion, if he had not brought it forward, I rose in the caucus, and said, “I will not be bound by any such proposition.” When it had arrived at the stage to which I refer,—the Senator from Maine will not forget it, for he interposed a remark which I will not quote now ——

MR. FESSENDEN. You had better quote it. I said, “Then you should not have voted on the subject, if you did not mean to be bound by the decision of the majority.”

MR. SUMNER. To which I replied, “I am a Senator of the United States.”

MR. FESSENDEN. I did not hear the reply.

MR. SUMNER. By that reply I meant that my obligations as a Senator were above any vote in caucus; that I had no right to go into caucus and barter away unquestioned rights on this floor. We are under obligations here to discharge our duties as Senators. We cannot in advance tie our hands. I have not said in so many words, “You violate the Constitution in doing

it." Perhaps better reflection would lead me to adopt the stronger language, and say, "You violate the National Constitution." I feel plainly, clearly, beyond doubt, that such is the character of the National Constitution, and such are our obligations under it, that we cannot, without a dereliction of duty, consent to such a proposition. So I see it; I cannot see it otherwise.

And now I submit to my associates in this body, with whom I am proud to act, whose good opinion I value, whether they would have me, feeling as I do regarding this resolution, act otherwise than as I do. Should I not, as an associate in this Chamber, anxious for the good name of the Senate to which we all belong, proud of this Republic whose honor we hope to bear aloft, and anxious that no precedent should be established which may hereafter be brought to our detriment, should I not enter my frank protest? And, doing so, do I deserve the rude suggestions that have been made to-day? Should I be told that one may not go into a caucus and assist in the debate, and then appear in this Chamber only with the bands of the caucus upon his hands?

Nor is the duty changed by the time of the protest. Vote or no vote makes no difference. No caucus could constrain a Senator on such a question. It was our duty to stay and resist the offensive proposition to the last, and then afterward resist it elsewhere. Senators, if they choose, may take it in their hands and bear it into this Chamber, to enshrine it in the rules of the Senate. If placed there, I know it will do no good; it will stay there to the dishonor of the country, and as a bad precedent for the future.

Mr. Howe spoke again, beginning his remarks as follows: "I am not so familiar with the history of this country as I wish I was. I do not know whether it has ever happened hitherto in the history of the country that a Senator has been arraigned before the Senate for a violation of a duty to a partisan caucus. If there ever has been such a trial before, I hope there never will be such a trial again." Mr. Yates concluded by saying: "Now, Sir, there is one of two things, and it commences this day: that the decisions of such consultations have to be carried out, or this day begins the death of any consultations by the majority in the Senate." Mr. Sumner followed.

MR. PRESIDENT,—It is evident that this debate has opened a broader question than was imagined at first. Doctors disagree. The learned Senator from Illinois differs from the learned Senator from Maine. One expounds the caucus obligations in one way, and the other in another. Now I am clear that this debate ought not to be closed without some defined code of caucus, and it seems to me that the learned Senators, so swift in judgment, ought to supply this code. It should be reduced to a text. We should know to what extent one is bound, and to what extent not bound: whether the Senator from Illinois, who refuses to be bound by the caucus in one point, which was fully discussed, is a man of honor; whether another Senator, who refuses to be bound on other points, is a man of honor. That question could be settled by some explicit code: for we have been admonished that we cannot differ from the caucus without a departure from propriety, if not from duty; and I do not know that stronger language has not been employed. If it has, I will not quote it. It seems to me that this should lead to a practical conclusion, and it is this: to have nothing to do with a proposition which can be discussed only through such avenues, which requires such refinement of detail, with

regard to which the Senator from Illinois makes one exception, and other Senators other exceptions, and to which still other Senators entirely object.

Now I am not going to complain of the Senator from Illinois. In following his convictions he is doing right; but then I wish him to understand that others on this floor may have the privilege he claims for himself,—justly claims; it is his title. I recognize the Senator as a man of honor, though he does refuse to carry out the decrees of the caucus. I believe that every Senator here has responsibilities as a Senator which are above any he can have to a caucus, which is only a meeting of friends for consultation and for harmony, where each gives up something with a view to a common result, but no man gives up a principle, no man gives up anything vital. No Senator can expect another Senator to give up anything vital; no Senator can expect another Senator to sacrifice a principle. I will not imagine that any Senator would sacrifice a principle. If a Senator expects another to accord with him in the conclusions of a caucus, I know well it is because he does not see it in the light of principle; but if another Senator does see it in the light of principle, how can he be expected to act otherwise than according to his light? It is not given to all to see with the clearness of the caucus-defenders. Theirs is the pathway of light; they see the obligation as complete. Others cannot see it so. I am in that list. I cannot see it as a final obligation. I have been present in many caucuses, and I believe, looking over the past, I have harmonized reasonably with my associates. Sometimes I have been constrained to differ, and have expressed that difference, and it has generally been received with kindness. The

other day I expressed the same difference, little expecting, however, an arraignment on this floor.

Here followed a conversation, in which Mr. Sumner, Mr. Yates, Mr. Howe, Mr. Grimes, of Iowa, and Mr. Thayer, of Nebraska, took part. Mr. Yates was willing to except from the resolution necessary legislation on the Western frontiers. Mr. Sumner continued :—

Now I submit to my excellent friend, whether his conclusion does not entirely impair the value of the caucus conclusion, except to this extent, in which we all agree, that it is an expression of the opinion of political associates, calculated to exercise a strong influence on the course of public business, and to be received with respect, but not to be imposed upon this Chamber as a rule.

MR. YATES. Allow me to ask the Senator whether he did not submit himself to the same sort of decision in the Reconstruction measures. Those matters were before a caucus, and acted upon.

MR. SUMNER. In the caucus on Reconstruction I moved the amendment that in the future constitutions of the Rebel States the ballot should be required. A division was had. I allude to it now because interrogated openly in the Senate. A division was had, and there were two stand-up votes, when the motion was carried by a vote of 15 to 13. By 15 to 13 in that caucus it was voted to require suffrage for all in the future constitutions of the Rebel States.

MR. EDMUNDS. And what would you have thought, if the thirteen had repudiated that action?

MR. SUMNER. To repudiate a proposition in favor of human liberty would have been a very different

thing from repudiating a proposition against human liberty.

MR. FESSENDEN. When the question is put to the Senator, what he would have thought, if the thirteen had repudiated it, he says that is a very different thing, being in favor of liberty.

MR. SUMNER. Very well, does not the Senator say the same ?

MR. FESSENDEN. I say there is no difference, where a man promises to do a thing with a full understanding ; he has no right to violate it, whether it is one way or the other.

MR. SUMNER. The question is, whether the man does promise. There is the point.

MR. FESSENDEN. Very well, then, my reply is, that, if there was no promise in the case of the thirteen to support the decision, there is no promise here ; if there was a promise in the case of the thirteen to be bound by it and support it, as they did, then there was a promise here. The Senator may make the distinction, if he can.

MR. SUMNER. I will make the distinction clear. I have never said there was a promise in the case of the thirteen, as I insist there was no promise in the recent caucus. Had the Senator felt it his duty to come into the Senate and oppose the report, I should have been pained to find him on the side of wrong ; but I am not ready to say that he would have been constrained by the caucus. But, plainly, the repudiation of a caucus vote for Human Rights is to be judged differently from the repudiation of a caucus vote adverse to Human Rights, — assuming, as I do, that there is no promise in either case.

Sir, I am tired of this talk of honor, in connection with the public business. This is too solemn; we are under too great responsibilities. Every Senator acts with honor. The Senator from Maine acts with honor, when he seeks to impose a rule which I think offensive to the spirit of the Constitution. The Senator from Illinois acts with honor, when he says that he will not be bound by the vote of this caucus in a particular case. Other Senators act with honor, when they refuse to be bound by the resolution in any of its terms. Every Senator acts with honor. He only acts otherwise who makes injurious imputations upon his associates.

Yes, Sir, let us have this caucus code. If it is to be administered with such severity, let us know it in advance, its terms and its conditions, — what extent of dishonor is to be visited upon those who do not adopt the caucus conclusions, and what extent of honor upon those who so steadfastly and violently carry them forward. Let us have the code. I believe, Sir, that the true code for the Senate is found in the National Constitution, in the rules of this body, and in the sentiments of right and wrong which animate every honest soul; and I believe that no advantage can be taken of any Senator by reminding him that he forbore at a particular moment to register his objection, just as if we were all there on trial, to be saved by speaking promptly. It was no such debate; we were there with friends and brothers, each respecting the sensibilities and convictions of his associates, and, by interchange of opinions, seeking harmony, but not submitting to a yoke.

After further remarks from Mr. Fessenden and Mr. Tipton, the substitute of Mr. Ross was rejected, — Yeas 15, Nays 19. The resolution was then adopted, — Yeas 23, Nays 9.

July 10th, Mr. Sumner called up the following, introduced by him July 8th : —

“ *Resolved*, That the resolution of the Senate, adopted the 5th of July last, limiting the business of the Senate, be, and hereby is, rescinded.”

In remarks that followed, he showed the character of the proceedings in the Twenty-Seventh Congress, which had been adduced as a precedent for the limitation of business. In reply to Mr. Fessenden, he said : —

I HAVE simply done my duty, in calling attention to the past precedent which had been introduced into the discussion. When it was introduced by the Senator from Maine, I had no means of replying to it. I had not the Journal or the Globe with me, and I supposed, from the statement of the Senator, that it was a resolution practically adopted in this Chamber. I was not aware of what followed. I was not aware of the extent to which the whole spirit of the proposition was denounced. Nor was I aware that its original mover, Mr. Clay, was obliged to abandon his proposition, — that he magnanimously, justly, and considerately abandoned it. That is the true precedent in this body ; and that is the precedent which, I submit, it would be better for the Senate to follow. Nothing, surely, could be lost by following it.

The resolution adopted by the Senate on Friday, while it remains, will only be of evil example. If hereafter quoted as a precedent, it may be at last for some purpose of oppression, when Senators will not all be as just as those I now have the honor of addressing. It may be seized then as an engine of tyranny. For one, Sir, I would leave no such weapon in this Chamber to be grasped hereafter by any hand.

The Senate refused to take up the resolution.

July 13th, Mr. Sumner made another attempt by the following resolution :—

“ *Resolved*, That the rule of the Senate limiting business be suspended, so far as to allow the consideration of the bill (S. No. 124) to enforce the several provisions of the Constitution abolishing Slavery, declaring the immunities of citizens, and guarantying a republican form of government by securing the elective franchise to colored citizens.”

But he was not able to obtain a vote upon it, and the important bill was left on the table.

RECONSTRUCTION ONCE MORE.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS; OFFICERS AND SENATORS WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF COLOR.

SPEECHES IN THE SENATE, ON THE THIRD RECONSTRUCTION BILL, JULY
11 AND 13, 1867.

JULY 8th, Mr. Trumbull, of Illinois, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported a "Bill to give effect to an Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the more efficient Government of the Rebel States,' passed March 2, 1867." This was the third Reconstruction measure of the present year. It was debated for several days. July 11th, Mr. Sumner said :—

MR. PRESIDENT,—Before offering amendments which I have on my table, I desire to call attention briefly to the character of this bill.

The subject of Reconstruction has been before Congress for many years. It first appeared in the Senate as a proposition of my own, as long ago as February, 1862. From that time it has been constantly present. If at any moment Congress has erred, it has been from inaction, and not from action. And now the same danger is imminent.

Mark, if you please, the stages. At every step there has been battle. Nothing could be proposed which was not opposed, often with feeling, sometimes even with

animosity. I do not speak now of the other side, but of friends on this side of the Chamber, some of whom have fought every measure.

To my mind nothing has been plainer from the beginning than the jurisdiction of Congress. Obviously it was not for the Executive, but for the Legislative. The President was commander-in-chief of the army; that function was his. But he could not make States or constitutions, or determine how States or constitutions should be made. All that he did to this end was gross usurpation, aggravated by motives and consequences.

Unquestionably the jurisdiction was in Congress; and I shall never cease to lament that it was not asserted promptly and courageously. Our delay has postponed the establishment of peace and reconciliation. Much as the President has erred, Congress has not been without error also. The President erred from assuming powers which did not belong to him; Congress erred from declining to assume powers which belonged to it. The sins of the President were of commission; the sins of Congress were of omission. The President did the things he ought not to have done; Congress left undone the things it ought to have done.

In the exercise of unquestioned jurisdiction, Congress should at once have provided civil governments, through whose influence and agency the Rebel States might have been shaped into republican forms. Such a proceeding would have been more constitutional and more according to the genius of our institutions than that which was adopted. It is hard to reconcile a military government, or any government born of military power, with the true idea of a republic. Tardily, too

tardily, Congress entered upon the work; and then began hesitations of another character. Even when assuming jurisdiction, it halted.

For a long time it refused to confer the suffrage upon the colored race. At last this was done.

Then it refused to exclude Rebels from the work of Reconstruction; and when at last it attempted something, its rule of exclusion was so little certain that an ingenious lawyer by a written opinion has set it aside.

There have been bills with riders, and after the passage of these bills there has been a supplementary bill with riders. And still further legislation is needed.

Surely these successive failures have their lesson. They admonish us now to make thorough work.

If you will not establish civil governments, with the military power simply as a support, then at least do not hesitate to vacate the existing governments, which are so many roots and centres of sedition. All the officers of these governments, from highest to lowest, exercise an influence adverse to a just reconstruction. They are in the way of peace and reconciliation. They increase the essential difficulties of forming new governments. Through their influence a hostile spirit is engendered and sustained. Such an obstacle should be removed.

At the same time be careful that Rebel influence is not allowed to prevail in the new governments. Of course this can be only by excluding Rebels during this transition period, until the new governments are formed. The rule of exclusion may be properly changed, when loyal and republican governments are established. Attention has already been called to cases deserving notice: as, for instance, naturalized citizens who have taken

an oath to support the National Constitution and afterward became Rebels, but yet are not excluded ; cadets at the Military and Naval Academies ; persons who have contributed to Rebel loans or invested money in Rebel bonds or securities ; contractors who furnished Rebel supplies ; also persons who, as authors, publishers, editors, contributors, or as speakers or preachers, encouraged the secession of any State or the waging of war against the United States.

Considering what we hear with regard to the boards of registration, — that in some States they are of doubtful principles, that in others colored fellow-citizens are excluded, so that a large proportion of the electors have no representation in the boards, — it seems to me that we ought by positive words to provide that the boards shall be constituted without distinction of color. Colored persons may be chosen to office, and I cannot doubt that we shall soon welcome colored Senators and Representatives to the National Capitol. Meanwhile the boards of registration must be kept as open as these Chambers ; and no commanding general can be allowed to set up a rule adverse to the rights of a race.

A system of public schools without distinction of color should be required. This important duty must not be left to caprice, or to the triumph of truth through local influence. Its performance should be enforced as essential to republican government. We have required suffrage for all ; we should require also education for all.

Provision should be made to invalidate the decrees of court in the Rebel States which have not been voluntarily executed. This is necessary for the protection of loyal persons. Look, for instance, at Texas, where,

according to recent report, immense sums have been taken by unjust decrees. If the remedy is not applied now, it is doubtful if the opportunity will not be lost forever.

In submitting a constitution to the people, it seems to me advisable that it should not be complicated by any election of officers, State or National, but that all elections should be postponed until after approval of the constitution by Congress.

There should also be penalties for the violation of the Act. The pardon of the President must not be allowed to confer a title to vote; and since officials have shown such a disposition to impair the efficacy of an Act by interpretation, reducing it to a mere shadow, we ought to provide that it shall be interpreted liberally.

In making these propositions, I ask that you should not hesitate simply because they may not be embraced within the terms of the original Acts. I would do now all that we can to make this measure of Reconstruction just and beneficent. I know no other rule worthy of the Senate or adequate to the occasion.

In carrying out these ideas, I propose to offer several amendments, which I will send to the Chair in order. I begin by an amendment as an additional section:—

“And be it further enacted, That every constitution in the Rebel States shall require the Legislature to establish and sustain a system of public schools open to all, without distinction of race or color.”

Mr. Trumbull objected to the amendment as not in order under the rule limiting the business of the session. The question of order was submitted to the Senate, and the amendment was ruled out of order, — Yeas 11, Nays 22.

Mr. Sumner then moved the following amendment, which he was sure must be in order, even under the stringent rule of the Senate : —

“ Provided, That no person shall be disqualified as member of any board of registration by reason of race or color.”

Mr. Conkling, of New York, inquired “whether there is any doubt upon the law, as it stands now, that men otherwise qualified are eligible, notwithstanding they are black.” Mr. Sumner replied : —

I AM accustomed to that class of questions on this floor. When, some two or three years ago, I felt it my duty to move, on one bill after another, that there should be no exclusion from the street cars on account of color, I was encountered by learned lawyers, and by none more constantly than my friend opposite, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. JOHNSON], with precisely the suggestion which my friend from New York now makes : that in point of law it was unnecessary ; that under the actual law, which was none other than the Common Law, there could be no exclusion on account of color : and yet, in the face of that Common Law, Senators all know that there was an exclusion from the cars on account of color, and the grossest outrages committed. Colored persons were precipitated into the streets, into the mud, under a pelting rain, and they could obtain no redress ; and when I asked for redress, grave Senators said, “Let them apply to the courts” ; and it was suggested that perhaps I had better volunteer as counsel in court rather than appear in this Chamber. Now the question of my friend from New York is precisely in the same spirit. I cannot doubt, that, under the existing Reconstruction law, there can be no exclusion on account of color, — that nobody is for that reason disqualified from the exercise of any

function. What is there to prevent a colored person from being a Senator of the United States? and who can doubt that within a very few months it will be our business to welcome a colored Senator on this floor? I cannot doubt it.

MR. JOHNSON [of Maryland]. How many?

MR. SUMNER. That I do not know. But I ask you who look to the colored vote in these States as the means of security and peace, through which you are to find protection for this Republic, and for white fellow-citizens there as well as for the colored themselves, to see that this stigma is not put upon them by any commanding general pretending to act by virtue of our legislation. It is not enough to tell me, that, under the actual law, colored persons may be designated. To that I reply, in the State of Virginia they have not been designated; and I wish now that Congress should declare that any exclusion on account of color is without the sanction of law.

And that brings me to the inquiry of my friend from Illinois, as to the penalty, I think, or as to the extent of the remedy.

MR. TRUMBULL. The question was, whether your proviso afforded any remedy.

MR. SUMNER. That I will answer. My proviso affords precisely the same remedy that it afforded on the Railroad Bills. It is in nearly the same terms. I followed those terms, because I know my friend likes good precedents, and we have enough of those on the question of the street cars. The Senate adopted that proviso at least half a dozen times. There it is, without penalty,

and yet it has been most efficacious, not only in these streets, but as an example throughout the country. Adopt this proviso now, and I am sure it will be most efficacious with our generals even without any penalty. Should they exclude fellow-citizens on account of color, it will be a violation of law and a failure of duty; there can be no votes of thanks for them, — “no hope of golden spurs to-day.”

Mr. Conkling replied : “I do not wish, for one, to vote for an amendment which I think carries nothing with it, but which simply incumbers the bill with unnecessary, and I might say verbose provisos.”

The amendment was rejected by a tie-vote, — Yeas 18, Nays 18.

At the next stage of the bill, Mr. Sumner renewed his amendment. In reply to Mr. Edmunds, of Vermont, Mr. Sumner said : —

I WILL not spend time. There has been an abuse which has come to our knowledge. We know that in whole States colored persons are excluded from the boards, and this justifies our intervention.

On this second trial the amendment was adopted, — Yeas 21, Nays 8.

Mr. Sumner offered the following : —

“And be it further enacted, That there shall be no elections of State or National officers under any new constitution until after the same has been approved by Congress.”

This was objected to by Mr. Trumbull, as out of order under the rule, and so decided by the Senate.

Mr. Sumner then moved the following amendment : —

“And be it further enacted, That in each of these States all judgments and decrees of court which have not been voluntarily executed, and which have been rendered subsequently to the date of the Ordinance of Secession in each State respectively, shall be subject to appeal to the highest court in the State, organized after the State shall be admitted again by Congress into the Union ; but no such appeal shall be allowed, unless the motion for the same shall have been lodged in the court, or clerk's office of the court, in which the decree was rendered, within sixty days after the governor appointed under this Act shall have entered upon the discharge

of the duties of his office, and for all judgments rendered subsequently to such date, within sixty days after the same have been rendered."

Mr. Trumbull objected to it as out of order under the rule. Mr. Sumner said:—

My attention has often been called to the necessity of such a provision, by gentlemen from the South, and especially by lawyers there. They tell me that without some such provision the grossest injustice will be done. Throughout the whole Rebellion the local tribunals were sitting to administer justice; yet it was not justice, but injustice, that they administered. Under their decrees private rights were overthrown; and I doubt not that my friend from Illinois has recently read the account of an extensive injustice in Texas, where private property to an almost incalculable amount was taken away by these unjust decrees.

Should there not be a remedy? I think all will say that there should be. This is, if I may so express myself, the last time of asking. If those States are once organized as States and received into the Union, I know not if we have the power of applying a remedy. That we have now I am sure. I cannot doubt our constitutional power at this moment to set aside all those decrees, so far as they have not been voluntarily submitted to, or subject them, according to the provision of my amendment, to appeal in a higher tribunal after the reorganization of justice in these States. Is not the provision reasonable? Is it not to serve the ends of justice? If you do not accept it now, can you accept it at any time hereafter? And if you do not accept it now or hereafter, will not these parties go without remedy? On that question I do not pronounce dogmatically. I do not mean to say

that they will be absolutely without remedy; but I do not easily see their remedy. I see difficulties in the way, while at this moment I see no difficulties in the way.

Then I encounter the objection that this is not in order. Why not? Is it not to carry out your Reconstruction Bill, to smooth difficulties, to remove wrong, to establish justice? It may not have been specially foreshadowed in the original bill or the supplemental bill; but I submit that it is entirely germane to both those bills. Besides, it is commended by an intrinsic justice, which should make it acceptable at any time.

The amendment was decided to be out of order.

Mr. Sumner then offered this amendment:—

“And be it further enacted, That all the provisions of this Act, and of the Acts to which this is supplementary, shall be construed liberally, to the end that all the intents thereof may be fully and perfectly carried out.”

There was no objection of order to this amendment, and it was agreed to without a division.

After further amendment the bill was ingrafted upon a House bill on the same subject and passed, — Yeas 32, Nays 6. Being referred to a Conference Committee, the report of the Committee was adopted: in the Senate, Yeas 31, Nays 6, — and in the House, Yeas 111, Nays 23.

July 13th, on the report of the Conference Committee in the Senate, Mr. Sumner said:—

AND now, as we are about to dismiss this subject for the present session, I cannot forbear again expressing regret that the measure has not been made more complete,—in one word, more radical. This is the third bill of Reconstruction on which we have acted. We ought never to have acted on more than one; and had the Senate been sufficiently radical, had it founded its bill on clear, definite principle, there would have

been no occasion for more than one. Just so far as we have failed to found ourselves on clear, definite principle, our bills have failed ; and should there be failure under the present bill, it will be precisely on that account.

I shall never cease to lament that Congress did not at once assume jurisdiction of the whole region, and in the exercise of its plenary authority establish civil governments, supplying ample military support. Such a Reconstruction would have been founded on principles to defy the criticism of history. I trust that what we have done will be judged leniently hereafter. I know, however, that it is not above criticism. Of course, such Reconstruction would have removed out of sight all existing State governments and municipal governments set up by Rebel authority, or by the President in the exercise of usurped power. In my opinion, it is not too late to do this last work. Even if you decline to establish civil governments, I think, that, under the Military Bill, you should go forward and brush away all the existing governments there. From information, private and public, out of every one of the Rebel States, I am led to this conclusion. Those governments, whether State or municipal, are just so many engines of Rebel influence. They stand in the way of Reconstruction. They prevent the beneficent operation of your work. But the Senate has declined that path. I regret it, and now at this last moment record my regret.

I am sorry to add that the Senate has declined to require of these people conditions which I think essential to republican government. One of these is a system of public education. I can never cease to mourn

the failure in this regard. Here is a paper from New Orleans, which has come to me since I have been at my desk to-day, edited by colored persons,—and an excellent paper it is,—“The New Orleans Tribune” of July 9, 1867, which contains an article entitled “Public Schools,” from which I will read a brief sentence:—

“Who will open the public schools to all children? We are of opinion that it will only be done by a colored mayor with colored members of the city council. This opinion is justified by facts.”

The article then sets forth the impediments in the way of public schools. And yet, in the face of such intelligence from the Rebel States, we decline to require a system of public education as an essential element in these new governments. I lament it; and I desire again to record this sentiment.

I fear also, Mr. President, that in the operation of this bill you will find that we have not been sufficiently explicit in the exclusion of Rebel influence. I have made my best effort to remove doubts and to enlarge the exclusion. But, in saying this, I desire to add, that, in my judgment, all exclusions belong to what I call the transition period. When Reconstruction is accomplished, the time will come for us to open the gates,—but not till then.

July 19th, the bill was vetoed by the President, and on the same day it was re-passed by a two-thirds vote of both Houses: in the Senate, Yeas 30, Nays 6, — and in the House, Yeas 109, Nays 25; so that it became a law.¹

¹ Statutes at Large, Vol. XV. pp. 14-16.

SUFFRAGE WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF COLOR THROUGH- OUT THE UNITED STATES BY ACT OF CONGRESS.

REMARKS IN THE SENATE, ON A BILL TO ENFORCE SEVERAL PRO-
VISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION BY SECURING THE ELECTIVE FRAN-
CHISE TO COLORED CITIZENS, JULY 12, 1867.

MARCH 26, 1867, Mr. Sumner asked, and by unanimous consent obtained, leave to introduce a bill to enforce the several provisions of the Constitution abolishing Slavery, declaring the immunities of citizens, and guarantying a republican form of government, by securing the elective franchise to colored citizens, which was read twice by its title and printed. He then remarked on the importance of the bill, and said that it was intended to cut the Gordian knot of the Suffrage question throughout the country.

At the session beginning July 3d, he made constant efforts for its consideration, challenging objection and argument.

July 12th, he moved its consideration, calling it "the Capstone of Reconstruction"; but the Third Reconstruction Bill was pressed by Mr. Trumbull, of Illinois, to the exclusion of the other. Mr. Sumner would not antagonize his bill with that. As soon as the other measure was disposed of, he pressed his bill again. It was objected to by Mr. Edmunds, of Vermont, as not in order under the rule of the session limiting business,¹ and the question of order was referred to the Senate. On this Mr. Sumner said:—

MY argument is precisely this, and I ask the attention of my friend from Maryland [Mr. JOHNSON]. We all know his eminence at the bar of the

¹ *Ante*, p. 193.

Supreme Court, and I submit to him this: We have already by Reconstruction Acts conferred the suffrage upon colored persons in the Rebel States; now is it not important that our legislation should be completed and rounded by conferring the suffrage in the other States as conferred in the Rebel States? You have conferred it in the Rebel States.

MR. JOHNSON. What has that to do with the other States?

MR. SUMNER. Will you have the great right of suffrage depend upon Act of Congress in one half of the Union, and not upon Act of Congress in the other half? If you can pass an Act for one half, can you not for the other half? I know the answer, that in the Rebel States the fact of rebellion gives a power we have not in the other States. But the present bill is founded not simply on the fact of rebellion, but on the clause in the National Constitution by which we are bound to guaranty a republican form of government throughout the whole country; also on the other clause by which Slavery is abolished throughout the whole country, and we are empowered by proper legislation to enforce it; also that further clause by which the rights of citizens are secured throughout the whole country, and we are empowered by proper legislation to enforce it. Here are three sources of power, equally applicable to all the States, Rebel or Loyal. And now I submit that such an Act for the Loyal States is only the just complement to our action in the Rebel States.

How can you look the Rebel States in the face, when you have required colored suffrage of them and fail to require it in the other States? Be just; require it in

the Loyal States as you have required it in the Rebel States. There is an unanswerable argument, and I submit it on the question of order. If we are privileged to consider only matters in aid of the original Reconstruction measures, then do I say that this bill is in aid of those measures, for it gives to them completeness and roundness. Without this bill your original measures are imperfect, ay, radically unjust. I know it is said there is one title to legislation over the Rebel States which we have not with regard to the Loyal States, — to wit, that they have been in rebellion. But the great sources of power in the two cases are identical; they are one and the same.

There is the guaranty clause in the National Constitution, the sleeping giant of the Constitution, never until this recent war awakened, but now it comes forward with a giant's power. There is no clause like it. There is no text which gives to Congress such supreme power over the States. Then, as I have so often said, are the two other clauses. Your power under the Constitution is not less complete than beneficent.

I am not to be betrayed into the constitutional argument. I am now on the question of order. I say that this bill is essential to perfect the original Reconstruction measures. You should not return to your homes without this additional Act by which Reconstruction is finished. If any Senator has any reason to bring against this bill, if any one can suggest a doubt of its constitutionality, I should like to hear the reason or the doubt, and I shall be ready to answer it. I invite discussion. I challenge the expression of any reason against it, or of any doubt with regard to its constitutionality; and I ask Senators to look at it as a great

measure of expediency as well as of justice. How will you settle this question in the Loyal States? Here are Delaware, Maryland,—my friend over the way will not be sensitive when I allude to his State,—and Kentucky, in each of which this measure will be the salvation of Union citizens. In other States, like Pennsylvania, it will rally at once—I am speaking now on the question of expediency—twenty thousand votes to the Union cause. In Indiana, too, it will settle the Suffrage question. I say nothing of Iowa. There is Wisconsin.

MR. TRUMBULL. They all vote there now.

MR. SUMNER. Under the decision of the Supreme Court. So much the better. There is Connecticut. It would obtain three thousand votes there for the good cause. A short Act of Congress will determine the political fortunes of Connecticut for an indefinite period by securing three thousand additional votes to the right side. There is New York, also, where the bill would have the same excellent beneficent influence.

Who, then, can hesitate? Look at it in any light you please. Regard it as the completion of these Reconstruction measures, as a constitutional enactment, or as a measure of expediency to secure results we all desire at the approaching elections, and who can hesitate? There has been no bill before you for a long time of more practical value than this. I hope there will be no question about proceeding with it, and that we may pass it before we separate to-night.

MR. EDMUNDS. I agree with my friend from Massachusetts, that the bill has very great merit. It has supreme moral merit. I agree to every word of it. I am a little

afraid, it is true, that there is a higher law that will bind us not to pass it, for want of power.

MR. SUMNER. Want of power! Will the Senator be good enough to state the reason?

MR. EDMUNDS. No, not on this point, because it is not relevant to this question of order.

MR. SUMNER. But, as the Senator is going into the question of the want of power, I really wish he would deign to enlighten us upon that.

MR. EDMUNDS. My friend will have to go without it, so far as I am concerned, for I shall not make it.

MR. SUMNER. Then I shall begin to think the Senator cannot.

MR. EDMUNDS. That is not a very dangerous state of things; but there are others who can.

The Senate decided the motion out of order, — Yeas 12, Nays 22.

July 13th, and again on the 15th, Mr. Sumner made another effort, by a resolution suspending the rule limiting business, so as to allow the consideration of this bill; but he could not get a vote on the resolution. The Senate rose without touching it.

OPENING OF OFFICES TO COLORED PERSONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

REMARKS IN THE SENATE, ON A BILL FOR THE FURTHER SECURITY OF
EQUAL RIGHTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, JULY 16, 1867.

JULY 16th, Mr. Sumner offered a petition from citizens of Washington, setting forth, that, under the existing charter of Washington, colored persons are excluded from office, and praying relief. He supported the petition with the following bill "for the further security of Equal Rights in the District of Columbia":—

"Be it enacted, &c., That in the District of Columbia no person shall be excluded from any office by reason of race or color, and all parts of laws making any such discrimination are hereby repealed."

The bill was read, when Mr. Sumner asked unanimous consent to proceed with its consideration.

I THINK there can be no objection to this bill. It is simply to carry out what is understood to be the effect of existing legislation, but which practically does not seem to be its effect. At the late election in the District it appeared that by the terms of the charter colored persons could not be qualified as aldermen, as common-councilmen, or as assessors; and on examining the charter, which I have now on my desk, I find that by its terms, strictly construed, these offices are confined to free white persons. By our legislation, all persons, without distinction of color, can be voters, but nothing is said about being office-holders. I cannot

doubt, that, under the Constitution, and particularly since the recent legislation, the discrimination adverse to colored persons is void; but practically it is not so regarded. I submit, therefore, that it is proper in Congress to remove this grievance.

Mr. Buckalew, of Pennsylvania, objected to its consideration, when Mr. Sumner gave notice that he should endeavor to call it up the next day. He gave further notice, that, if any objection were made, he should move to suspend the rule limiting business so far as to allow this bill to be considered.

July 17th, on motion of Mr. Sumner, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill. Mr. Hendricks, of Indiana, then said:—

“The Senator from Massachusetts was the author of the proposition that the colored people should vote. He made the commencement of that policy with the District of Columbia. He now claims—and I believe his party friends have come up to his position—that that is to be made universal throughout the States. I suppose he will be frank enough to inform us whether it is intended as the commencement of the policy that negroes shall be allowed to become office-holders, to hold both Federal and State offices throughout the country,—whether he regards this as the inauguration of that policy. I suppose he does, from the fact that he expressed with a great deal of warmth, the other day, the desire that he might see colored Senators here in a very short time. If we are to regard it as the inauguration of the policy, it is well enough to know it.”

Without any reply, Mr. Sumner asked for a vote, when the bill was passed,—Yeas 25, Nays 5.

July 18th, in the other House, the bill was reported by Mr. Wilson, of Iowa, from the Judiciary Committee, with the following substitute, intended to avoid in legislation the repetition of the phrase “race or color.”

“The word ‘white,’ wherever it occurs in the laws relating to the District of Columbia or in the charter or ordinances of the city of Washington or Georgetown, and operates as a limitation on the right of any elector of said District or either of said cities to hold any office or to be selected and to serve as a juror, be and the same is hereby repealed; and it shall be unlawful for any person or officer to enforce or attempt to enforce said limitation after the passage of this Act.”

The substitute was adopted, and the bill thus amended passed,—Yeas 90, Nays 20.

July 19th, the Senate concurred in the amendment, and, on motion of Mr. Harlan, of Iowa, further amended the bill by an additional section authorizing "the necessary grand and petit jurors for the June term of the Criminal Court for the year 1867." This amendment, though not relating to Equal Rights, was concurred in by the House.

July 20th, the bill was duly enrolled and transmitted to the President for his signature, but was not returned by him before the adjournment, the same day, so that it failed to become a law. Mr. Sumner complained that Senators "proposed to go home and leave Equal Rights in the District without the protection we owe them."

November 21st, on the first day of the meeting of Congress after the adjournment, Mr. Sumner introduced the same bill as it had passed both Houses, and asked the Senate to proceed with it at once; but this was prevented by the objection of Mr. Davis, of Kentucky. Mr. Sumner forbore calling it up for eleven consecutive days of the session, to see if within that time it would be returned to Congress, with or without objections. It was not returned, and on application at the Department of State it was ascertained that it had not been received there.

December 5th, the bill was taken up, on motion of Mr. Sumner, discussed, and again passed, — Yeas 32, Nays 8.

December 9th, it passed the House, — Yeas 104, Nays 39.

December 11th it was presented to the President.

December 20th, Congress adjourned for the holidays.

The President, by a message, January 24, 1868, in reply to an inquiry of the Senate, stated that it was presented for his approval December 11, 1867, but that "Congress by their adjournment [December 20th] prevented the return of the bill within the time prescribed by the Constitution."

January 7th, Mr. Sumner a third time introduced the same bill. Mr. Sherman, of Ohio, thought "we ought to consider whether it is not already a law." Mr. Edmunds, of Vermont, said that "this bill has become a law, if it has not been returned with a veto." Under these circumstances, the bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee to consider its true condition and the question of further legislation.

February 11, 1869, the bill being once more before the Senate, Mr. Sumner moved it again, as appears by the following passage.

MR. SUMNER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill No. 228.

MR. DRAKE [of Missouri]. What is it?

MR. SUMNER. A bill for the further security of Equal Rights in the District of Columbia. I will make one minute's explanation, and then the Senate will see that it ought to be passed. This bill has already twice passed both Houses of Congress, but immediately before recesses, and it has fallen from the President failing to return it with his veto, and from the unsettled condition of the practice or law in such cases.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. MORGAN, of New York, in the chair]. It requires the unanimous consent of the Senate to consider the bill at this time.

MR. DRAKE. I appeal to the honorable Senator from Massachusetts on behalf of a poor and most worthy woman —

MR. SUMNER. Why should the Senator make that appeal to me? I appeal on behalf of all the colored people in this District, who ask the passage of this bill.

MR. CONKLING [of New York]. Whether the objection should be made or not depends perhaps upon this, which I should like to inquire: Has not this bill not only passed twice, I think three times, but has it not become a law certainly once?

MR. SUMNER. It has not become a law; at least, it has not found place in the statute-book, and the courts have declined to recognize it as law. Under the circumstances, it has seemed the best and the shortest way for Congress to pass it again, so as to remove all doubt.

The bill passed the Senate without a division, and, March 2d, it again passed the other House without a division. Again it failed to receive the signature of the President, nor was it returned with his objections.

March 6th, at the opening of a new Congress, with a new President, Mr. Sumner introduced it again, and asked unanimous consent to proceed with its consideration; but Mr. Vickers, of Maryland, objected.

March 8th, it passed the Senate without a division; March 15th, passed the other House, — Yeas 111, Nays 46; March 18th, was approved by the President, and so at last became a law.¹

¹ Statutes at Large, Vol. XVI. p. 3.

NATURALIZATION WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF RACE OR COLOR.

REMARKS IN THE SENATE, ON A BILL TO STRIKE OUT THE WORD
“WHITE” IN THE NATURALIZATION LAWS, JULY 19, 1867.

JULY 19th, Mr. Sumner introduced a bill to amend the several Acts of Congress relating to Naturalization, by striking out the word “white,” and he asked unanimous consent of the Senate to consider the bill at once. Mr. Edmunds, of Vermont, objected. Mr. Sumner then said:—

I HOPE the Senator will not object. I have received a letter from Norfolk, calling attention to the case of a colored person there, an inhabitant for more than twenty-five years, but unable to obtain naturalization because of the words of color in our naturalization laws. It is only reasonable that we should put an end to that grievance. In short, I would punch the word “white” out of the statute-book, wherever it appears. If the Senator from Vermont is disposed to keep it in, then I can understand that he would object to the bill.

MR. EDMUNDS. I am not disposed to keep it in——

MR. SUMNER. I did not suppose the Senator was.

MR. EDMUNDS. My punch is not quite so case-hardened as that of my friend.

And he insisted upon its reference to the Committee on the Judiciary, "so that there may be that examination which will make the bill perfect, if it is not now perfect, to answer the end that my friend from Massachusetts and myself both want to reach." The bill was referred accordingly.

February 17, 1869, Mr. Stewart, of Nevada, reported the bill from the Committee adversely. In the few remaining days of the session Mr. Sumner was unable to call it up.

THE PRESIDENT MUST BE WATCHED BY CONGRESS, OR REMOVED.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, ON THE RESOLUTION OF ADJOURNMENT, JULY 19, 1867.

JULY 19th, the Senate considered a resolution from the other House to reassemble November 13th. Mr. Sherman, of Ohio, moved to amend by making the day of meeting "the first Monday of December next." Mr. Sumner moved to amend the amendment by substituting "the second Wednesday of October next." He then said :—

ON that question I have a word to say, and I must speak frankly. I cannot help it. How Congress, after listening to the message of to-day,¹ which is only the logical consequence of other messages, can quietly vote to go home and leave this post of duty until next winter, passes my understanding. To me it is incomprehensible. The message, from beginning to end, is a menace. Needless to quote its precise language. Its defiant tone fills this Chamber, and will soon fill the whole country. Listening to this appeal, so well calculated to revive the dying Rebellion, I felt that one of two things was needed,—the removal of its author from the Executive chair, or Congress in permanent session to watch and counteract him. Such is the alternative. One failing, the other must be.

¹ The Veto of the Third Reconstruction Act.

Now, Sir, when thus insisting, let it be understood that I am not unmindful of any of my responsibilities in this Chamber. Other duties may devolve upon me hereafter. For the present I speak as a Senator, bound, in the discharge of official duty, to do what he can for the public good. As a Senator, I must be plain; nor can I be constrained by the possibility that hereafter I may be called to judge the President. I am called to judge him now. The proposition that Congress should go home compels me to judge him.

Unquestionably it is for the other House to initiate the proceedings which shall bring the President to your bar. But until then it is the right and duty of every Senator to express himself freely with regard to his conduct; nor can there be any limit to this latitude. It is as broad as human thought. No future duty can be a strait-jacket now. Because the President may be impeached, the Senate is not obliged to be silent with regard to him. The National Constitution is guilty of no such absurdity. Until a Senator is sworn on the trial of impeachment, according to the requirement of the National Constitution, he is a Senator, free to criticize any public functionary, from the President to the humblest officer; and if either has so acted as to deserve removal, there is no reason why he should not say so. This is only according to the National Constitution and common sense.

Now, since Andrew Johnson remains President and he is not yet at your bar, I cannot doubt that we ought to stay in our seats to encounter the evil proceeding from him. We must meet him constantly, and not leave the field unoccupied.

For this reason, simply and briefly stated, I object

to the motion of the Senator from Ohio. If I had powers of persuasion, I would use them all to induce you to remain as a guard to the National Constitution and a constabulary force for the Rebel States. Possibly you may not like the office. But I doubt if any of us can be better employed anywhere than in contributing to the success of Reconstruction, and in preserving peace throughout that distressed region of country. Sitting in our seats here, we are a mighty police, ready at the call of general or citizen, and also a terror to the evil-doer.

Senators wish to leave. So do I. Nobody can wish to leave more than myself. I suffer much from these heats. I long to be at home. But I feel that it is my duty to be here. All that I have felt before is now intensified by the menace of this message. Hereafter no Senator can say that he did not know what to expect. He will not be taken by surprise. Here is distinct and open notice that the President will do all in his power to thwart your legislation and to arrest a just Reconstruction. There he stands, a constant impediment to peace, and an ally to the Rebellion. And yet, knowing these things, it is proposed to go home and leave him undisturbed master till winter.

Mr. Sherman said: "It does seem to me a very strange thing that a judge, by whose vote alone the President can be removed, should declare that he must be removed. [Mr. Sumner said, "Or Congress must stay here to watch him."] . . . If the House of Representatives desire to present an impeachment of any officer of the Government, I am perfectly willing to stay and try him. No such case is presented." Mr. Buckalew, of Pennsylvania, said: "The Senator from Massachusetts who first spoke [Mr. SUMNER] maintains his usual position at the end of this session. I do not remember any occasion when that member supported a resolution of adjournment. I do not remember an occasion when he did not vote for reassembling, when the opportunity

was afforded him, at an early date. In fact, I suspect, that, if the truth were known, the Senator from Massachusetts would be prepared with business the whole three hundred and sixty-five days of the year, and that, if we consulted his views, we should make a French revolutionary assemblage of the two Houses of Congress, — we should be in permanent session, without vacation and without recess." He insisted that "we should withhold ourselves from the expression of judgment upon a question which is not here, and which cannot come here, unless it be brought here by the House of Representatives, over whose action we have no control." This brought up Mr. Sumner again.

MR. PRESIDENT, — There is just the point. The Senator says the question is not here, — in other words, that this is not the time to discuss the President. He is mistaken; this is the very time. The question is here at the instance of the Senator from Ohio, who gravely moves that we leave our seats, and from this time forward till December abdicate our constitutional guardianship of the public interests. To such a proposition there is but one natural and logical reply. It is, that we must not abdicate, so long as Andrew Johnson is in the Executive chair. If he continues President, we must remain at our posts, precisely as Grant remained before Richmond.

Sir, if another person wielded the Executive powers of the nation, if there was anybody in that high office mindful of the National Constitution as interpreted by the Declaration of Independence, and disposed to carry forward the Acts of Congress adopted by such triumphant majorities, then I could vote with Senators to go home. Unhappily, it is not so. Anything but this. Our President is a public enemy, successor in spirit and opinion of Jefferson Davis, through whom the Rebellion is once more on its legs. Does any Senator, accustomed to vote with the Union party and to

sustain the Union cause, question this simple statement of fact? Does he believe it overdrawn? Let him answer, if he does. Let him say where my language goes by a hair's breadth beyond the exact truth.

Here Mr. Sumner stopped for answer, and then proceeded.

Because we have the successor of Jefferson Davis in the Presidential chair, therefore Congress must stay. That is my argument. A volume or oration could not add to the force of this simple statement.

The more I think of this duty, the more commanding it seems. The President is the Executive; we are the Legislative. His influence is great; but ours is greater. If we choose to say so, we can be masters. We can apply the corrective to his mischief. Surely here is a motive. Ten States are now exposed to his malign influence, all of which may be arrested by our presence here. Let it be known that we are to continue in our seats, and every Union man throughout the Rebel States will feel stronger. He will be conscious at once of a panoply, which the President, and the Rebel tail, of which he is the head, cannot penetrate.

There are the generals, also, who, as soon as we are gone, may be his victims. The telegraph may flash to us, in the comfort of home, that the gallant Sheridan, as true in government as he was skilful in war, has been driven from his post by an enemy with whom he could not contend. It may flash the removal of Pope, who has shown such talent and thoroughness in the organization of his district, and also the displacement of Sickles, who has carried into his new duties such varied experience and patriotic purposes. All this may

occur ; for the President is vindictive in his assault upon the upholders of Human Rights. Is it not worth our care to provide against such calamity ? But you propose to go home and leave all, whether citizen or general, a prey to the President. I protest against it.

The amendment of Mr. Sumner was rejected. That of Mr. Sherman was adopted, and the resolution as amended was then agreed to, — Yeas 23, Nays 14. On the report of a Committee of Conference, it was amended again by making the adjournment to “the 21st day of November next,” which was adopted by the Senate, — Yeas 17, Nays 14, — Mr. Sumner voting in the negative.

SYMPATHY WITH CRETE, AND AN APPEAL TO THE TURKISH GOVERNMENT.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS IN THE SENATE, JULY 19, 1867, AND JULY 21,
1868.

JULY 19th, reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations by
Mr. Sumner:—

RESOLUTION declaring sympathy with the suffering people of
Crete.

***R**ESOLVED by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the people of the United States feel a strong sympathy with the people of Crete, constituting a part of the Greek family, to which civilization owes so much; that they are pained by the report of the present sufferings of this interesting people; and they unite in the hope that this declaration, which they feel it their duty to make, will be favorably considered by the Government of Turkey in determining its policy towards Crete.*

SEC. 2. *And be it further resolved, That it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to communicate this resolution to the Government of Turkey.*

On the same day, this resolution was, by unanimous consent, read three times, and passed both Houses, and on the next day approved by the President.¹

¹ Statutes at Large, Vol. XV. p. 31.

July 21, 1868, the contest of the Cretans for independence still continuing, Mr. Sumner reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations the following joint resolution :—

JOINT RESOLUTION appealing to the Turkish Government in behalf of the people of Crete.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the people of the United States renew the expression of their sympathy with the suffering people of Crete, to whom they are bound by the ties of a common religion, and by the gratitude due to the Greek race, of which the Cretans are a part ; that they rejoice to believe that the sufferings of this interesting people may be happily terminated by a policy of forbearance on the part of the Turkish Government ; and they hereby declare their earnest hope that the Turkish Government will listen kindly to this representation, and will speedily adopt such generous steps as will secure to Crete the much-desired blessings of peace, and the advantage of autonomic government.

SEC. 2. *And be it further resolved, That religion, civilization, and humanity require that the existing contest in Crete should be brought to a close ; and to accomplish this result, the civilized powers of the world should unite in friendly influence with the Government of Turkey.*

SEC. 3. *And be it further resolved, That it shall be the duty of the President to instruct the minister of the United States at Constantinople to coöperate with the ministers of other powers in all good offices to terminate the sufferings of the people of Crete : and that it shall be the further duty of the President to*

communicate a copy of this resolution to the Government of Turkey.

The resolution was considered on the same day, and passed without a division.

July 25th, it passed the other House without a division.

July 27th, it was approved by the President.¹

These two resolutions gave expression to the sentiments of the American people, who sympathized strongly in the Cretan struggle for independence. For a time the courage and determination of the insurgents inspired confidence, and it seemed as if they would prevail; but, after a protracted struggle, they succumbed to superior force. The following contemporary account is from the Washington correspondent of the *Boston Journal*.

"Mr. Sumner's resolutions appealing to the Turkish Government in behalf of Crete, which were passed by both Houses of Congress, have been much spoken of in diplomatic circles. Some think they were too late, as in their opinion the Cretans are already vanquished. This is not the opinion with the Greek Legation, who is very hopeful, and insists that the Turks can never prevail. The resolutions themselves, even among those who do not sympathize with their object, are regarded as a masterpiece of composition, inasmuch as, while very strong, they did not fail in courtesy toward the Turkish Government. There was a great pressure to have the independence of Crete acknowledged, especially by the Greek Legation, and by friends of the Cretans in Massachusetts; but Mr. Sumner took the ground that independence was a fact to be determined by evidence, and that, whatever might be the opinion of individuals with regard to the future result, there was no official evidence showing that independence was yet established."

¹ Statutes at Large, Vol. XV. pp. 263, 264.

PRIVILEGES OF DEBATE IN THE SENATE ON OFFICERS LIABLE TO IMPEACHMENT.

RESOLUTIONS IN THE SENATE, JULY 20, 1867.

THE misconduct of the President, and his obstruction of important legislation, naturally aroused judgment and indignation. The question was then raised with regard to the privileges of the Senate. July 20th, in the debate on adjournment, Mr. Fessenden, of Maine, said: "The time has come, undoubtedly, when there is a very serious difference of opinion in Congress upon a very important question. With regard to the Senate, I have considered that upon that question it was not proper for a Senator to express an opinion, or even, if he could avoid it, to form an opinion." Mr. Sumner never doubted the complete immunity of the Senate, and its duty to consider these things in advance of impeachment, and he spoke accordingly. On the day of Mr. Fessenden's remarks he offered the following resolutions, which were ordered to be printed.

RESOLUTIONS declaring the privileges of debate in the Senate with regard to civil officers liable to impeachment.

WHEREAS it has been asserted that the conduct of a civil officer liable to impeachment cannot be freely considered and condemned by Senators in the course of legislative proceedings;

And whereas such an opinion is calculated to impair the just privileges of debate: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Constitution, in providing for the impeachment of "all civil officers" of the National Government, embracing the President, members of the

Cabinet, diplomatic representatives, and other civil functionaries, did not intend to limit debate in the Senate on the conduct of any civil officer, so far as the same may arise in legislative proceedings; that any other interpretation is inconsistent with the privileges of the Senate, and tends directly to shield misconduct in civil office.

Resolved, That the Constitution expressly declares, that, when sitting to try an impeachment, the Senate "shall be on oath or affirmation," thus superadding a judicial oath to that already taken as Senator; that from the taking of this oath the judicial character of the Senate begins, and until then each Senator is free to express himself openly on the conduct of any civil officer, and thereupon to invite the judgment of the Senate and the country; that at times this may be a duty, and is always a sacred right, which cannot be renounced or abridged.¹

¹ The character of the Senate as a court of impeachment was discussed by Mr. Sumner in his Opinion on the Impeachment of President Johnson.

PROPHETIC VOICES CONCERNING AMERICA.

A MONOGRAPH.

I have another and a far brighter vision before my gaze. It may be but a vision, but I will cherish it. I see one vast confederation stretching from the frozen North in unbroken line to the glowing South, and from the wild billows of the Atlantic westward to the calmer waters of the Pacific main, — and I see one people, and one language, and one law, and one faith, and, over all that wide continent, the home of Freedom, and a refuge for the oppressed of every race and of every clime. — JOHN BRIGHT, *Speech at Birmingham*, December 18, 1862: *Speeches on Questions of Public Policy*, ed. Rogers, (London, 1868,) Vol. I. p. 225.

THIS monograph appeared originally in the "Atlantic Monthly" for September, 1867. It is now revised and enlarged. In the celebration of our hundredth birthday as a nation, now fast approaching, these prophetic voices will be heard, teaching how much of present fame and power was foreseen, also what remains to be accomplished.

C. S.

MARCH, 1874.

History shows that the civilization to which we belong is subject to a general law which makes it advance with halts, in the manner of armies, in the direction of the Occident, making the sceptre pass successively into the hands of nations more worthy to hold it, more strong and more able to employ it for the general good.

So it seems that the supreme authority is about to escape from Western and Central Europe, to pass to the New World. In the northern part of that other hemisphere offshoots of the European race have founded a vigorous society full of sap, whose influence grows with a rapidity that has never yet been seen anywhere. In crossing the ocean, it has left behind on the soil of old Europe traditions, prejudices, and usages, which, as *impedimenta* heavy to carry, would have embarrassed its movements and retarded its progressive march. In about thirty years the United States will have, according to all probability, a hundred millions of population, in possession of the most powerful means, distributed over a territory which would make France fifteen or sixteen times over, and of the most wonderful disposition. . . .

Vainly do the occidental and central nations of Europe attribute to themselves a primacy, which, in their vanity, they think sheltered from events and eternal: as if there were anything eternal in the grandeur and prosperity of societies, the works of men! — MICHEL CHEVALIER, *Rapports du Jury International: Exposition Universelle de 1867 à Paris*, Tom. I., Introduction, pp. DXIV–DXVI.

America, and especially Saxon America, with its immense virgin territories, with its republic, with its equilibrium between stability and progress, with its harmony between liberty and democracy, is the continent of the Future, — the immense continent stretched by God between the Atlantic and Pacific, where mankind may plant, essay, and resolve all social problems. [*Loud cheers.*] Europe has to decide whether she will confound herself with Asia, placing upon her lands old altars, and upon the altars old idols, and upon the idols immovable theocracies, and upon the theocracies despotic empires, — or whether she will go by labor, by liberty, and by the republic, to coöperate with America in the grand work of universal civilization. — EMILIO CASTELAR, *Speech in the Spanish Cortes*, June 22, 1871.

MONOGRAPH.

THE discovery of America by Christopher Columbus is the greatest event of secular history. Besides the potato, the turkey, and maize, which it introduced at once for the nourishment and comfort of the Old World,¹ and also tobacco, which only blind passion for the weed could place in the beneficent group, this discovery opened the door to influences infinite in extent and beneficence. Measure them, describe them, picture them, you cannot. While yet unknown, imagination invested this continent with proverbial magnificence. It was the Orient, and the land of Cathay. When afterwards it took a place in geography, imagination found another field in trying to portray its future history. If the Golden Age is before, and not behind, as is now happily the prevailing faith, then indeed must America share, at least, if it does not monopolize, the promised good.

Before the voyage of Columbus in 1492, nothing of America was really known. Scanty scraps from antiquity, vague rumors from the resounding ocean, and the

¹ In the Description of England, prefixed to Holinshed's Chronicles, and dated 1586, one of these gifts is mentioned: "Of the potato and such venerous roots as are brought out of Spaine, Portingale, and the Indies to furnish vp our bankets, I speake not." Book II. Ch. VI., Vol. I. p. 281 (London, 1807).

hesitating speculations of science were all that the inspired navigator found to guide him. Foremost among these were the well-known verses of Seneca, so interesting from ethical genius and a tragical death, in the chorus of his "Medea," which for generations had been the finger-point to an undiscovered world:—

" Venient annis
 Secula seris, quibus Oceanus
 Vincula rerum laxet, et ingens
 Pateat tellus, Tiphysque novos
 Detegat orbes, nec sit terris
 Ultima Thule." ¹

These verses are vague and lofty rather than specific; but Bacon, after setting them forth, says of them, "A prophecy of the discovery of America"; and this they may well be, if we adopt the translation of Archbishop Whately, in his notes to the Essay on Prophecies: "There shall come a time in later ages, when Ocean shall relax his chains and a vast continent appear, and a pilot shall find new worlds, and Thule shall be no more earth's bound."² Fox, turning from statesmanship to scholarship, wrote to Wakefield: "The prophecy in Seneca's 'Medea' is very curious indeed."³ Irving says of it: "Wonderfully apposite, and shows, at least, how nearly the warm imagination of a poet may approach to prophecy. The predictions of the ancient oracles were rarely so unequivocal."⁴ These verses were adopted by Irving as a motto on the title-page of the revised edition of his "Life of Columbus."

¹ Act. II. 374–379.

² Bacon's Essays, annot. Whately, (London, 1858,) p. 379.

³ June 20, 1800. Memorials and Correspondence, ed. Russell, Vol. IV. p. 393.

⁴ Life of Columbus, Appendix, No. XXIV., Author's Revised Edition, (New York, 1860,) Vol. III. p. 402.

Two copies are extant in the undoubted handwriting of Columbus, — precious autographs to tempt collectors, — both of them in his book on the Prophecies.¹ By these the great admiral sailed.

Humboldt gives the verses in the following form : —

“ Venient annis sæcula seris,
Quibus Oceanus vincula rerum
Laxet, et ingens pateat tellus,
Tethysque novos detegat orbes,
Nec sit terris ultima Thule.”²

This sympathetic and authoritative commentator, who has illustrated the enterprise with all that classical or mediæval literature affords, declares his conviction that the discovery of a new continent was more completely foreshadowed in the simple geographical statement of the Greek Strabo,³ who, after a long life of travel, sat down in his old age, during the reign of Augustus, to write the geography of the world, including its cosmography. In this work, where are gathered the results of ancient study and experience, the venerable author, after alluding to the possibility of passing direct from Spain to India, and explaining that the inhabited world is that which we inhabit and know, thus lifts the curtain: “ There may be in the same temperate zone *two and indeed more inhabited lands*, especially near the parallel of Thineæ or Athens, prolonged into the Atlantic Ocean.”⁴ This was the voice of ancient Science.

¹ Navarrete, Coleccion de los Viajes y Descubrimientos, Tom. II. pp. 264, 272. Humboldt, Examen Critique de l'Histoire de la Géographie du Nouveau Continent, Tom. I. p. 101.

² Examen Critique, Tom. I. p. 162.

³ Ibid., pp. 152, 165.

⁴ Geographica, Lib. I. p. 65, C. Comp. Lib. II. p. 118, C. See Humboldt, Examen Critique, Tom. I. pp. 147, seqq.; Cosmos, tr. Otté, Vol. II. pp. 516, 556, 557, 645.

Before the voyage of Columbus two Italian poets seem to have beheld the unknown world. The first was Petrarca; nor was it unnatural that his exquisite genius should reach behind the veil of Time, as where he pictures

“The daylight hastening with wingèd steps,
Perchance to gladden the expectant eyes
Of far-off nations in a world remote.”¹

The other was Pulci, who, in his “Morgante Maggiore,” sometimes called the last of the romances and the earliest of Italian epics, reveals an undiscovered world beyond the Pillars of Hercules:—

“Know that this theory is false; his bark
The daring mariner shall urge far o’er
The western wave, a smooth and level plain,
Albeit the earth is fashioned like a wheel.
Man was in ancient days of grosser mould,
And Hercules might blush to learn how far
Beyond the limits he had vainly set
The dullest sea-boat soon shall wing her way.

“Men shall descry another hemisphere,
Since to one common centre all things tend;
So earth, by curious mystery divine
Well balanced, hangs amid the starry spheres.
At our Antipodes are cities, states,
And throngèd empires, ne’er divined of yore.
But see, the sun speeds on his western path
To glad the nations with expected light.”²

This translation is by our own eminent historian, Prescott, who first called attention to the testimony,³ which is not mentioned even by Humboldt. Leigh

¹ “ . . . che l’ di nostro vola
A gente, che di là forse l’ aspetta.”

Rime, Part. I. Canzone V.

² Canto XXV. st. 229, 230.

³ History of Ferdinand and Isabella, Vol. II. pp. 117, 118.

Hunt referred to it at a later day.¹ Pulci was born in 1431, and died about 1487, five years before Columbus sailed; so that he was not aided by any rumor of the discovery he so distinctly predicts.

Passing from the great event which gave a new world not only to Spain, but to civilized man, it may not be uninteresting to collect some of the prophetic voices concerning the future of America and the vast unfolding of our continent. They will have a lesson also. Seeing what has been fulfilled, we may better judge what to expect. I shall set them forth in the order of time, prefacing each prediction with an account of the author sufficient to explain its origin and character. If some are already familiar, others are little known. Brought together in one body, on the principle of our National Union, *E pluribus unum*, they must give new confidence in the destinies of the Republic.

Only what has been said sincerely by those whose words are important deserves place in such a collection. Oracles had ceased before our history began; so that we meet no responses paltering in a double sense, like the deceptive replies to Cræsus and to Pyrrhus, nor any sayings which, according to the quaint language of Sir Thomas Browne, "seem quodlibetically constituted, and, like a Delphian blade, will cut on both sides."² In Bacon's Essay on Prophecies there is a latitude not to be followed. Not fable or romance, but history, is the true authority; and here experience and genius are the lights by which our prophets have walked. Doubtless there

¹ Stories from the Italian Poets, (London, 1846,) Vol. I. p. 295.

² Christian Morals, Part II. Sec. 3: Works, ed. Wilkin, (London, 1835,) Vol. IV. p. 81.

is a difference in human faculties. Men who have lived much and felt strongly see further than others. Their vision penetrates the future. Second-sight is little more than clearness of sight. Milton tells us that

"Old experience doth attain
To something like prophetic strain."

Sometimes this strain is attained even in youth. But here Genius with divine power lifts the curtain and sweeps the scene.

The elder Disraeli, in his "Curiosities of Literature," has a chapter on "Prediction," giving curious instances, among which is that of Rousseau, toward the end of the third book of "Émile," where he says, "We approach a condition of crisis and the age of revolutions."¹ Our own Revolution was then at hand, soon followed by that of France. The settlement of America was not without auguries even at the beginning.

A PROPHEPIC GROUP.

BEFORE passing to the more serious examples, I bring into group a few marking at least a poet's appreciation of the newly discovered country, if not a prophetic spirit. The Muse was not silent at the various reports. As early as 1595, Chapman, famous as the translator of Homer, in a poem on Guiana, thus celebrates and commends the unknown land:—

"Guiana, whose rich feet are mines of gold,
Whose forehead knocks against the roof of stars,
Stands on her tiptoes, at fair England looking,
Kissing her hand, bowing her mighty breast,

¹ Œuvres, (Paris, 1821-23,) Tom. VIII. p. 336. Curiosities of Literature, (London, 1849,) Vol. III. p. 301, note.

And every sign of all submission making,
To be her sister, and the daughter both
Of our most sacred Maid.

And there do palaces and temples rise
Out of the earth and kiss the enamored skies,
Where New Britannia humbly kneels to Heaven,
The world to her, and both at her blest feet
In whom the circles of all empire meet." ¹

In similar strain, Drayton, who flourished under James the First, says of Virginia:—

"And ours to hold
Virginia,
Earth's only paradise.

"Where Nature hath in store
Fowl, venison, and fish,
And the fruitfull'st soil,
Without your toil,
Three harvests more,
All greater than your wish.

"To whose the Golden Age
Still Nature's laws doth give,
No other cares that 'tend
But them to defend
From winter's age,
That long there doth not live." ²

Daniel, poet-laureate and contemporary, seemed to foresee the spread of our English speech, anticipating our own John Adams:—

"And who (in time) knows whither we may vent
The treasure of our tongue? To what strange shores
This gain of our best glory shall be sent,
T' enrich unknowing nations with our stores?
What worlds, in th' yet unform'd Occident,
May come refined with th' accents that are ours?" ³

¹ *De Guiana Carmen Epicum*: Hakluyt, *Voyages*, (London, 1600,) Vol. III. pp. 668-672.

² *To the Virginian Voyage*: Anderson's *British Poets*, Vol. III. p. 583.

³ *Musophilus*: *Ibid.*, Vol. IV. p. 217.

The emigration prompted by conscience and for the sake of religious liberty inspired the pious and poetical Herbert to famous verses:—

“Religion stands on tiptoe in our land,
Ready to pass to the American strand.”¹

The poet died in 1632, twelve years after the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth, and only two years after the larger movement of the Massachusetts Company, which began the settlement of Boston. The verses saw the light with difficulty, being refused the necessary license; but the functionary at last yielded, calling the author “a divine poet,” and expressing the hope that “the world will not take him to be an inspired prophet.”² Fuller, writing a little later, was perhaps moved by Herbert, when he said: “I am confident that America, though the youngest sister of the four, is now grown marriageable, and daily hopes to get Christ to her husband by the preaching of the Gospel.”³ In a different vein, a contemporary poet, the favorite of Charles the First, Thomas Carew, in a masque performed by the monarch and his courtiers at Whitehall, February 18, 1633, made sport of New England, saying that it had “purged more virulent humors from the politic body than guaiacum and all the West Indian drugs have from the natural bodies of this kingdom.”⁴ But these words uttered at the English Court were praise.

Then came answering voices from the Colonies. Rev. William Morrell, of the Established Church, a settler

¹ The Church Militant, 239, 240. ² Life, by Izaak Walton.

³ The Holy State, Book III. Ch. 16: *Of Plantations*.

⁴ *Colum Britannicum*: Anderson's British Poets, Vol. III. p. 716.

of 1623, said of New England, in a Latin poem translated by himself:—

*"A grandchild to Earth's paradise is born,
Well-limbed, well-nerved, fair, rich, sweet, yet forlorn."*¹

"The Simple Cobbler of Agawam," another name for Rev. Nathaniel Ward, of Ipswich, Mass., at the close of his witty book, first published in 1647, and having four different editions in this single year, sends an invitation to those at home:—

*"So farewell, England Old!
If evil times ensue,
Let good men come to us,
We'll welcome them to New."*

Another witness we meet in the writings of Franklin. It is George Webb, who, decamping from Oxford and the temptations of scholarship, indented himself according to the usage of the times, and became what Franklin calls "a bought servant" on our shores, where his genius flowered in the prophetic couplet, written in 1727:—

*"Europe shall mourn her ancient fame declined,
And Philadelphia be the Athens of mankind."*²

Another, Gulian Verplanck, of New York, in verses written in England in 1773, foretells the repetition of British wealth, power, and glory in the New World:—

*"In other worlds another Britain see,
And what thou art America shall be."*³

And yet another, Hugh Henry Brackenridge, born

¹ Coll. Mass. Hist. Soc., Vol. I. p. 126.

² Griswold's Poets and Poetry of America, (Philadelphia, 1856,) p. 22.

³ Ibid., p. 29. — Mr. Webster, quoting these lines, attributes them to an anonymous "English poet." Speech at the Festival of the Sons of New Hampshire, November 7, 1849: Works, Vol. II. p. 510.

in Scotland, and a graduate of our Princeton College in 1771, in a Commencement poem on "The Rising Glory of America," pictured the future of the continent, adopting as a motto the verses of Seneca twice quoted by Columbus:—

"This is thy praise, America, thy power,
Thou best of climes by Science visited,
By Freedom blest, and richly stored with all
The luxuries of life! Hail, happy land,
The seat of empire, the abode of kings,
The final stage where Time shall introduce
Renowned characters, and glorious works
Of high invention and of wondrous art,
Which not the ravages of Time shall waste,
Till he himself has run his long career!"¹

To these add Voltaire, who, in his easy verse, written in 1751, represents God as putting fever in European climates, "and the remedy in America."²

From this chorus, with only one discordant voice, I pass to a long line of voices so distinct and full as to be recognized separately.

JOHN MILTON, 1641.

THE list opens with John Milton, whose lofty words are like an overture to the great drama of emigration, with its multitudes in successive generations. If not a prophet, he has yet struck a mighty key-note in our history.

The author of "Paradise Lost," of "Comus," and the heroic Sonnets, needs no special mention beyond the

¹ Duyckinck's *Cyclopædia of American Literature*, Vol. I. p. 299.

² "Il met la fièvre en nos climats,
Et le remède en Amérique."

Épître LXXV., Au Roi de Prusse : Œuvres,
(édit. 1784,) Tom. XIII. p. 170.

two great dates of birth and death. He was born 9th December, 1608, and died 8th November, 1674. The treatise from which I quote was written in 1641.

“What numbers of faithful and free-born Englishmen and good Christians have been constrained to forsake their dearest home, their friends and kindred, whom nothing but the wide ocean and the savage deserts of America could hide and shelter from the fury of the bishops! Oh, Sir, if we could but see the shape of our dear mother England, as poets are wont to give a personal form to what they please, how would she appear, think ye, but in a mourning weed, with ashes upon her head and tears abundantly flowing from her eyes, to behold so many of her children exposed at once and thrust from things of dearest necessity, because their conscience could not assent to things which the bishops thought indifferent? . . . Let the astrologer be dismayed at the portentous blaze of comets and impressions in the air, as foretelling troubles and changes to states; I shall believe there cannot be a more ill-boding sign to a nation (God turn the omen from us!) than when the inhabitants, to avoid insufferable grievances at home, are enforced by heaps to forsake their native country.”¹

Here in a few words are the sacrifices made by our fathers, as they turned from their English homes, and also the conscience which prompted and sustained them. Begun in sacrifice and in conscience, their empire grew and flourished with constant and increasing promise of future grandeur.

ABRAHAM COWLEY, 1667.

CONTEMPORARY with Milton, and at the time a rival for the palm of poetry, was Abraham Cowley, born

¹ Of Reformation touching Church Discipline in England, Book II.: Works, (London, 1851,) Vol. III. pp. 44, 45.

1618, died 28th July, 1667. His biography stands at the head of Johnson's "Lives of the English Poets," the first in that instructive collection. The two poets were on opposite sides,—Milton for the Commonwealth, Cowley for the King.

His genius was recognized in his own time; and when he died, at the age of forty-nine, after a night of exposure under the open sky, Charles the Second said, "Mr. Cowley has not left a better man behind him in England." He was buried in Westminster Abbey, near Chaucer and Spenser.

He composed, in much-admired Latin verse, six books on Plants: the first and second in elegiac verse, displaying the qualities of herbs; the third and fourth in various measures, on the beauties of flowers; and the fifth and sixth in hexameters, like the Georgics, on the uses of trees. The first two books, in Latin, appeared in 1662; the other four, also in Latin, were not published till 1668, the year after his death. They did not see the English light till near the close of the century, when a translation was published by Tate, from which I quote.

Two fruits of America are commemorated. The first is that which becomes Chocolate:—

"Guatimala produced a fruit unknown
To Europe, which with pride she called her own :
Her Cacao-Nut, with double use endued,
(For Chocolate at once is drink and food,)
Does strength and vigor to the limbs impart,
Makes fresh the countenance and cheers the heart." ¹

The other is the Cocoa-Nut:—

"While she preserves this Indian palm alone,
America can never be undone ;

¹ Book V. 874-879.

Embowelled, and of all her gold bereft,
 Her liberty and Coccus only left,
 She's richer than the Spaniard with his theft."¹

The poet, addressing the New World, becomes prophetic : —

"To live by wholesome laws you now begin,
 Buildings to raise, and fence your cities in,
 To plough the earth, to plough the very main,
 And traffic with the universe maintain.
 Defensive arms, and ornaments of dress,
 All implements of life, you now possess.
 To you the arts of war and peace are known,
 And whole Minerva is become your own.
 Our Muses, to your sires an unknown band,
 Already have got footing in your land.

• • • • •
 "Long rolling years shall late bring on the times,
 When, with your gold debauched and ripened crimes,
 Europe, the world's most noble part, shall fall,
 Upon her banished gods and virtue call
 In vain, while foreign and domestic war
 At once shall her distracted bosom tear, —
 Forlorn, and to be pitied even by you.
*Meanwhile your rising glory you shall view;
 Wit, learning, virtue, discipline of war,
 Shall for protection to your world repair,
 And fix a long illustrious empire there.*

• • • • •
 "Late Destiny shall high exalt your reign,
 Whose pomp no crowds of slaves, a needless train,
 Nor gold, the rabble's idol, shall support,
 Like Motezume's or Guanapaci's court,
 But such true grandeur as old Rome maintained,
 Where Fortune was a slave, and Virtue reigned."²

This prophecy, though appearing in English tardily, may be dated from 1667, when the Latin poem was already written.

¹ Book V. 955-959.

² Ibid., 1202-1237.

SIR THOMAS BROWNE, 1682.

DR. JOHNSON called attention to a tract of Sir Thomas Browne entitled "A Prophecy concerning the Future State of Several Nations," where the famous author "plainly discovers his expectation to be the same with that entertained lately with more confidence by Dr. Berkeley, *that America will be the seat of the fifth empire.*"¹ The tract is vague, but prophetic.

Sir Thomas Browne was born 19th October, 1605, and died 19th October, 1682. His tract was published two years after his death, in a collection of Miscellanies, edited by Dr. Tenison. As a much-admired author, some of whose writings belong to our English classics, his prophetic prolusions are not unworthy of notice. Among them are the following:—

"When New England shall trouble New Spain ;
When Jamaica shall be lady of the isles and the main ;
When Spain shall be in America hid,
And Mexico shall prove a Madrid ;

*When Africa shall no more sell out their blacks,
To make slaves and drudges to the American tracts ;*

*When America shall cease to send out its treasure,
But employ it at home in American pleasure ;
When the New World shall the Old invade,
Nor count them their lords, but their fellows in trade ;*

Then think strange things are come to light,
Whereof but few have had a foresight."²

Some of these words are striking, especially when we consider their early date. In a commentary on each

¹ Life of Sir Thomas Browne : Works, (Oxford, 1825,) Vol. VI. p. 490.

² Works, ed. Wilkin, (London, 1835,) Vol. IV. pp. 232, 233.

verse the author seeks to explain it. New England is "that thriving colony which hath so much increased in our days"; its people are already "industrious," and when they have so far increased "that the neighboring country will not contain them, they will range still farther, and be able in time to set forth great armies, seek for new possessions, or *make considerable and conjoined migrations.*"¹ The verse touching Africa will be fulfilled "when African countries shall no longer make it a common trade to sell away their people." And this may come to pass "whenever they shall be well civilized, and acquainted with arts and affairs sufficient to employ people in their countries: if also they should be converted to Christianity, but especially unto Mahometism; for then they would never sell those of their religion to be slaves unto Christians."² The verse concerning America is expounded thus:—

"That is, When America shall be better civilized, new policied, and divided between great princes, it may come to pass that they will no longer suffer their treasure of gold and silver to be sent out to maintain the luxury of Europe and other parts; but rather employ it to their own advantages, in great exploits and undertakings, magnificent structures, wars, or expeditions of their own."³

The other verse, on the invasion of the Old World by the New, is explained:—

"That is, When America shall be so well peopled, civilized, and divided into kingdoms, *they are like to have so little regard of their originals as to acknowledge no subjection unto them:* they may also have a distinct commerce between

¹ Works, ed. Wilkin, Vol. IV. p. 233.

² Ibid., p. 235.

³ Ibid., p. 236.

themselves, or but independently with those of Europe, and may hostilely and piratically assault them, even as the Greek and Roman colonies after a long time dealt with their original countries."¹

That these speculations should arrest the attention of Dr. Johnson is something. They seem to have been in part fulfilled. An editor quietly remarks, that, "to judge from the course of events since Sir Thomas wrote, we may not unreasonably look forward to their more complete fulfilment."²

SIR JOSIAH CHILD AND DR. CHARLES DAVENANT, 1698.

IN contrast with the poets, but mingling with them in forecast, were two writers on Trade, who saw the future through facts and figures, or what one of them called "political arithmetic," even discerning colonial independence in the distance. These were Sir Josiah Child, born 1630 and died 1699, and Dr. Charles Davenant, born 1656 and died 1714.

Child is mentioned by De Foe as "originally a tradesman"; others speak of him as "a Southwalk brewer"; and McCulloch calls him "one of the most extensive, and, judging from his work, best-informed, merchants of his time."³ He rose to wealth and consideration, founding a family which intermarried with the nobility. His son was known as Lord Castlemaine, Earl Tylney, of Ireland. Davenant was eldest son of "rare Sir William," the author of "Gondibert," and, like his eminent father, a dramatist. He was also member of Parliament, and wrote much on commercial

¹ Works, ed. Wilkin, Vol. IV. pp. 236, 237.

² Ibid., p. 231, note.

³ The Literature of Political Economy, p. 42.

questions ; but here he was less famous than Child, whose "New Discourse of Trade," so far as it concerned the interest of money, first appeared in 1668, and since then has been often reprinted and much quoted. There was an enlarged edition in 1694. That now before me appeared in 1698, and in the same year Davenant published his kindred "Discourses on the Public Revenues and on the Trade of England," among which is one "on the Plantation Trade." The two authors treated especially the Colonies, and in similar spirit.

The work of Child was brought to more recent notice by the voluminous plodder, George Chalmers, particularly in his writings on the Colonies and American Independence,¹ and then again by the elder Disraeli, in his "Curiosities of Literature," who places a prophecy attributed to him in his chapter on "Prediction." After referring to Harrington, "who ventured to predict an event, not by other similar events, but by a theoretical principle which he had formed," and to a like error in De Foe, Disraeli quotes Chalmers :—

"Child, foreseeing from experience that men's conduct must finally be decided [directed] by their principles, foretold the colonial revolt. De Foe, allowing his prejudices to obscure his sagacity, reprobated that suggestion, because he deemed interest a more strenuous prompter than enthusiasm."

The pleasant hunter of curiosities then says :—

"The predictions of Harrington and De Foe are precisely such as we might expect from a petty calculator, — a politi-

¹ See *Opinions on Interesting Subjects of Public Law and Commercial Policy arising from American Independence*, p. 108. A motto on the reverse of the title-page is from Child.

cal economist, who can see nothing farther than immediate results; but the true philosophical predictor was Child, who had read *the past*.”¹

Disraeli was more curious than accurate. His excuse is, that he followed another writer.² The prediction attributed to Child belongs to Davenant.

The work of Child is practical rather than speculative, and shows a careful student of trade. Dwelling on the “plantations” of England and their value, he considers their original settlement, and here we find a painful contrast between New England and Virginia.³ Passing from the settlement to the character, New England is described as “being a more independent government from this kingdom than any other of our plantations, and the people that went thither more one peculiar sort or sect than those that went to the rest of our plantations.”⁴ He recognized in them “a people whose frugality, industry, and temperance, and the happiness of whose laws and institution, do promise to themselves long life, with *a wonderful increase of people, riches, and power*.”⁵ And then: “Of all the American plantations, his Majesty hath none so apt for the building of shipping as New England, nor none comparably so qualified for breeding of seamen, not only by reason of the natural industry of that people, but principally by reason of their cod and mackerel fisheries.”⁶ On his last page are words more than complimentary:—

¹ Curiosities of Literature, (London, 1849,) Vol. III. p. 303.

² Chalmers, Life of De Foe, p. 68.

³ A New Discourse of Trade, (London, 1698,) p. 183.

⁴ Ibid., p. 201.

⁵ Ibid., p. 212.

⁶ Ibid., p. 215.

"To conclude this chapter, and to do right to that most industrious English colony, I must confess, that, though we lose by their unlimited trade with our foreign plantations, yet we are very great gainers by their direct trade to and from Old England: our yearly exportations of English manufactures, malt, and other goods, from hence thither, amounting, in my opinion, to ten times the value of what is imported from thence."¹

Here is keen observation, but hardly prophecy.

Contrast this with Davenant:—

"As the case now stands, we shall show that they [the Colonies] are a spring of wealth to this nation, that they work for us, that their treasure centres all here, and that the laws have tied them fast enough to us; so that it must be through our own fault and misgovernment, *if they become independent of England*. . . . Corrupt governors by oppressing the inhabitants may hereafter provoke them to withdraw their obedience, and by supine negligence or upon mistaken measures we may let them grow, more especially New England, in naval strength and power, *which if suffered, we cannot expect to hold them long in our subjection*. If, as some have proposed, we should think to build ships of war there, we may teach them an art which will cost us some blows to make them forget. Some such courses may, indeed, drive them, or put it into their heads, *to erect themselves into independent Commonwealths*."²

Davenant then, following Child, remarks upon New England as "the most proper for building ships and breeding seamen," and adds:—

"So that, if we should go to cultivate among them the art of navigation and teach them to have a naval force, *they*

¹ A New Discourse of Trade, (London, 1698,) p. 216.

² Discourses on the Public Revenues, (London, 1698,) Part II. pp. 204, 205.

*may set up for themselves and make the greatest part of our West India trade precarious."*¹

These identical words are quoted by Chalmers, who exclaims: "Of that prophecy we have lived, alas! to see the fulfilment."²

Chalmers emigrated from Scotland to Maryland, and practised in the colonial courts, but, disgusted with American independence, returned home, where he wrote and edited much, especially on colonial questions, ill concealing a certain animosity, and on one occasion stating that among the documents in the Board of Trade and Paper Office were "the most satisfactory proofs of the settled purpose of the revolted colonies, from the epoch of the Revolution in 1688, to acquire direct independence."³ But none of these proofs are presented. The same allegation was also made by Viscount Bury in his "Exodus of the Western Nations,"⁴ but also without proofs.

The name of De Foe is always interesting, and I cannot close this article without reference to the saying attributed to him by Chalmers. I know not where in his multitudinous writings it may be found, unless in his "Plan of the English Commerce," and here careful research discloses nothing nearer than this:—

"What a glorious trade to England it would be to have those colonies increased with a million of people, to be clothed, furnished, and supplied with all their needful things, food excepted, only from us, and *tied down forever*

¹ Discourses on the Public Revenues, (London, 1698,) Part II. p. 206.

² Opinions on Interesting Subjects, p. 108.

³ Opinions of Eminent Lawyers on Various Points of English Jurisprudence, chiefly concerning the Colonies, etc., Preface, p. xvi.

⁴ Vol. II. pp. 295, seqq.

*to us by that immortal, indissoluble bond of trade, their interest !”*¹

In the same work he says :—

“This is certain, and will be granted, that the product of our improved colonies raises infinitely more trade, employs more hands, and, I think I may say, by consequence, brings in more wealth to this one particular nation or people, the English, than all the mines of New Spain do to the Spaniards.”²

In this vision the author of “Robinson Crusoe” was permitted to see the truth with regard to our country, although failing to recognize future independence.

BISHOP BERKELEY, 1726.

It is pleasant to think that Berkeley, whose beautiful verses predicting the future of America are so often quoted, was so sweet and charming a character. Atterbury said of him : “So much understanding, so much knowledge, so much innocence, and such humility I did not think had been the portion of any but angels, till I saw this gentleman.”³ Swift said : “He is an absolute philosopher with regard to money, titles, and power.”⁴ Pope let drop a tribute which can never die :—

“To Berkeley every virtue under Heaven.”⁵

Such a person was naturally a seer.

¹ A Plan of the English Commerce, (London, 1728,) pp. 360, 361.

² Ibid., pp. 306, 307. See also The Complete English Tradesman, Chap. XXVI.: Miscellaneous Works, (Oxford, 1841,) Vol. XVII. pp. 254, seqq.

³ Letters by Several Eminent Persons, ed. Duncombe, (London, 1773,) Vol. I. p. 107, note.

⁴ Letter to Lord Carteret, September 3, 1724 : Works, ed. Scott, (Edinburgh, 1824,) Vol. XVI. p. 441.

⁵ Epilogue to the Satires, Dialogue II. 73.

He is compendiously called an Irish prelate and philosopher. Born in the County of Kilkenny, 1684, and dying in Oxford, 1753, he began as a philosopher. While still young, he wrote his famous treatise on "The Principles of Human Knowledge," where he denies the existence of matter, insisting that it is only an impression produced on the mind by Divine power. After travel for several years on the Continent, and fellowship with the witty and learned at home, among whom were Addison, Swift, Pope, Garth, and Arbuthnot, he conceived the project of educating the aborigines of America, which was set forth in a tract, published in 1725, entitled "A Proposal for the better Supplying of Churches in our Foreign Plantations, and for Converting the Savage Americans to Christianity, by a College to be erected in the Summer Islands, otherwise called the Isles of Bermuda." Persuaded by his benevolence, the Minister¹ promised twenty thousand pounds, and there were several private subscriptions, to promote what was called by the King "so pious an undertaking." Berkeley possessed already a deanery in Ireland, worth eleven hundred pounds a year. Turning away from this residence, and refusing to be tempted by an English mitre, offered by the Queen, he set sail for Rhode Island, "which lay nearest to Bermuda," where, after a tedious passage of more than four months, he arrived 23d January, 1729. Here he lived on a farm back of Newport, having been, according to his own report, "at very great expense in purchasing land and stock."² In familiar letters he has recorded his impression of this place, famous since for

¹ Sir Robert Walpole.

² Letter to Thomas Prior, May 7, 1730 : Works, (Dublin, 1784,) Vol. I. p. lvii.

fashion. "The climate," he says, "is like that of Italy, and not at all colder in the winter than I have known it everywhere north of Rome. . . . This island is pleasantly laid out in hills and vales and rising grounds, hath plenty of excellent springs and fine rivulets, and many delightful landscapes of rocks and promontories and adjacent islands. . . . The town of Newport contains about six thousand souls, and is the most thriving, flourishing place in all America for its bigness. It is very pretty, and pleasantly situated. I was never more agreeably surprised than at the first sight of the town and its harbor."¹ He seems to have been contented, and when his companions went to Boston stayed at home, "preferring," as he wrote, "quiet and solitude to the noise of a great town, notwithstanding all the solicitations that have been used to draw us thither."²

The money he had expected, especially from the King's ministers, failed, and after waiting in vain expectation two years and a half, he returned to England, leaving an infant daughter buried in the churchyard of Trinity, and bestowing upon Yale College a library of eight hundred and eighty volumes, as well as his estate in Rhode Island. During his residence at Newport he preached every Sunday, and was indefatigable in pastoral duties, besides meditating, if not composing, "The Minute Philosopher," which was published shortly after his return.

In his absence he had not been forgotten at home; and shortly after his return he became Bishop of Cloyne, in which place he was most exemplary, de-

¹ Letter to Thomas Prior, April 24, 1729: *Works*, Vol. I. p. liii.

² To Same, March 9, 1730: *Ibid.*, p. lv.

voting himself to his episcopal duties, to the education of his children, and the pleasures of composition.

It was while occupied with his plan of a college, especially as a nursery for the colonial churches, shortly before sailing for America, that the great future was revealed to him, and he wrote the famous poem, the only one found among his works, entitled "Verses on the Prospect of Planting Arts and Learning in America."¹ The date may be fixed at 1726. Such a poem was an historic event. I give the first and last stanzas.

"The Muse, disgusted at an age and clime
Barren of every glorious theme,
*In distant lands now waits a better time,
Producing subjects worthy fame.*
.
.
.
Westward the course of empire takes its way;
The four first acts already past,
A fifth shall close the drama with the day;
Time's noblest offspring is the last."

It is difficult to exaggerate the value of these verses, which have been so often quoted as to have become a commonplace of literature and politics. There is nothing from any oracle, there is very little from any prophecy, which can compare with them. The biographer of Berkeley, who wrote in the last century, was very cautious, when, after calling them "a beautiful copy of verses," he says that "another age perhaps will acknowledge the old conjunction of the prophetic character with that of the poet to have again taken place."² The *vates* of the Romans was poet and prophet; and such was Berkeley.

Mr. Webster calls this an "extraordinary prophecy,"

¹ Works, Vol. II. pp. 441 - 444.

² Bp. Stock, Life of Berkeley, prefixed to Works, Vol. I. p. xv.

and then says: "It was an intuitive glance into futurity; it was a grand conception, strong, ardent, glowing, embracing all time since the creation of the world and all regions of which that world is composed, and judging of the future by just analogy with the past. And the inimitable imagery and beauty with which the thought is expressed, joined to the conception itself, render it one of the most striking passages in our language."¹

The sentiment which prompted the prophetic verses of the excellent Bishop was widely diffused, or perhaps it was a natural prompting.² Of this illustration is afforded in the life of Benjamin West. On his visit to Rome in 1760, the young artist encountered a famous improvisatore, who, learning that he was an American come to study the fine arts in Rome, at once addressed him with the ardor of inspiration, and to the music of his guitar. After singing the darkness which for so many ages veiled America from the eyes of Science, and also the fulness of time when the purposes for which this continent had been raised from the deep would be manifest, he hailed the youth before him as an instrument of Heaven to create there a taste for the arts which elevate man, and an assurance of refuge to science and knowledge, when, in the old age of Europe, they should have forsaken her shores. Then, in the spirit of prophecy, he sang:—

"But all things of heavenly origin, like the glorious sun, move westward; and Truth and Art have their periods of shining and of night. Rejoice, then, O venerable Rome,

¹ Address at the Laying of the Corner-Stone of the Addition to the Capitol, July 4, 1851: Works, Vol. II. p. 596. See also p. 510.

² Grahame, History of the United States, Vol. IV. pp. 136, 448.

in thy divine destiny ! for, though darkness overshadow thy seats, and though thy mitred head must descend into the dust, *thy spirit, immortal and undecayed, already spreads towards a new world.*"¹

John Adams, in his old age, dwelling on the reminiscences of early life, records that nothing in his reading was "more ancient in his memory than the observation that arts, sciences, and empire had travelled westward, and in conversation it was always added, since he was a child, that their next leap would be over the Atlantic into America." With the assistance of an octogenarian neighbor, he recalled a couplet which he had heard repeated "for more than sixty years":—

"The Eastern nations sink, their glory ends,
And empire rises where the sun descends."

The tradition was, as his neighbor had heard it, that these lines came from some of our early Pilgrims, by whom they had been "inscribed, or rather drilled, into a rock on the shore of Monument [Manomet] Bay in our Old Colony of Plymouth."²

Another illustration of this same sentiment is found in Burnaby's "Travels through the Middle Settlements in North America, in 1759 and 1760," a work first published in 1775. In reflections at the close the traveller remarks:—

"An idea, strange as it is visionary, has entered into the minds of the generality of mankind, *that empire is travelling westward ; and every one is looking forward with eager and impatient expectation to that destined moment when America is to give law to the rest of the world.*"³

¹ Galt's Life of West, Part I. pp. 116, 117.

² Letter to Benjamin Rush, May 23, 1807: Works, Vol. IX. pp. 599, 600.

³ Travels, (London, 1775, 4to,) p. 89.

The traveller is none the less an authority for the prevalence of this sentiment because he declares it "illusory and fallacious," and records his conviction that "America is formed for happiness, but not for empire." Happy America! What empire can compare with happiness? Making amends for this admission, the jealous traveller, in his edition of 1798, after the adoption of the National Constitution, announces "that the present union of the American States will not be permanent, or last for any considerable length of time," and "that that extensive country must necessarily be divided into separate states and kingdoms."¹ Thus far the Union has stood against all shocks, foreign or domestic; and the prophecy of Berkeley is more than ever in the popular mind.

SAMUEL SEWALL, 1697-1727.

BERKELEY saw the sun of empire travelling westward. A contemporary whose home was made in New England, Samuel Sewall, saw the New Heaven and the New Earth. He was born at Bishop-Stoke, England, 28th March, 1652, and died at Boston, 1st January, 1730. A child emigrant in 1661, he became a student and graduate of our Cambridge; in 1692, Judge of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts; in 1718, Chief Justice. He was of the court which condemned the witches, but afterwards, standing up before the congregation of his church, made public confession of error, and his secret diary bears testimony to his trial of conscience. In harmony with this contrition was his early feeling for the enslaved African, as witness his tract,

¹ Preface, p. xi.

"The Selling of Joseph," so that he may be called the first of our Abolitionists.

Besides an "Answer to Queries respecting America," in 1690, and "Proposals touching the Accomplishment of Prophecies," in 1713, he wrote another work, with the following title:—

"Phænomena quædam Apocalyptica ad Aspectum Novi Orbis configurata: Or, Some Few Lines towards a Description of the New Heaven as it makes to those who stand upon the New Earth. By Samuel Sewall, A. M., and sometime Fellow of Harvard College at Cambridge in New England."

The copy before me is the second edition, with the imprint, "Massachuset, Boston. Printed by Bartholomew Green, and sold by Benjamin Eliot, Samuel Gerish, and Daniel Henschman. 1727." There is a prophetic voice even in the title, which promises "some few lines towards a description of the New Heaven as it makes to those who stand upon the New Earth." This is followed by verses from the Scriptures, among which is Isaiah, xi. 14: "But they shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines toward the west"; also, Acts, i. 8: "Ye shall be witnessess unto me unto the uttermost part of the earth,"—quoting here from the Spanish Bible, "*hasta lo ultimo de la tierra.*"

Two different Dedications follow,—the first dated "Boston, N. E., April 16th, 1697." Here are words on the same key with the title:—

"For I can't but think that either England or New England, or both, (together is best,) is the only bridemaïd mentioned by name in David's prophetic Epithalamium, to assist at the great wedding now shortly to be made. . . .

Angels incognito have sometimes made themselves guests to men, designing thereby to surprise them with a requital of their love to strangers. In like manner the English nation, in showing kindness to the aboriginal natives of America, may possibly show kindness to Israelites unawares. . . . Instead of being branded for slaves with hot irons in the face and arms, and driven by scores in mortal chains, they shall wear the name of God in their foreheads, and they shall be delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God. . . . Asia, Africa, and Europe have each of them had a glorious Gospel-day. None, therefore, will be grieved at any one's pleading that America may be made coparcener with her sisters in the free and sovereign grace of God."

In the second Dedication the author speaks of his book as "this vindication of America."

Then comes, in black letter, what is entitled "Psalm 139, 7 - 10," containing this stanza : —

"Yea, let me take the morning wings,
And let me go and hide :
Even there where are the farthest parts,
Where flowing sea doth slide.
Yea, even thither also shall
Thy reaching hand me guide ;
And thy right hand shall hold me fast,
And make me to abide."

Entering upon his subject, our prophet says : —

"Whereas New England, and Boston of the Massachusetts, have this to make mention of, that they can tell their age, and account it their honor to have their birth and parentage kept in everlasting remembrance. And in very deed, the families and churches which first ventured to follow Christ thorow the Atlantic Ocean into a strange land full of wild men were so religious, their end so holy, their self-denial in pursuing of it so extraordinary, that I can't but hope

that the plantation has thereby gained a very strong crasis, and that it will not be of one or two or three centuries only, but by the grace of God it will be very long lasting.”¹

Then again : —

“New Jerusalem will not straiten and enfeeble, but wonderfully dilate and invigorate Christianity in the several quarters of the world, — in Asia, in Africa, in Europe, and in America. And one that has been born, or but lived in America more than threescore years, it may be pardonable for him to ask, Why may not that be the place of New Jerusalem ?”²

And here also : —

“Of all the parts of the world which do from this charter entitle themselves to the government of Christ, America’s plea, in my opinion, is the strongest. For when once Christopher Columbus had added this fourth to the other three parts of the foreknown world, they who sailed farther westward arrived but where they had been before. The globe now failed of offering anything new to the adventurous traveller, — or, however, it could not afford another New World. And probably the consideration of America’s being *the beginning of the East and the end of the West* was that which moved Columbus to call some part of it by the name of Alpha and Omega. Now if the last Adam did give order for the engraving of his own name upon this last earth, ’t will draw with it great consequences, even such as will in time bring the poor Americans out of their graves and make them live.”³

Again he says : —

“May it not with more or equal strength be argued : New Jerusalem is not the same with Jerusalem ; but as Jerusalem was to the westward of Babylon, so New Jerusalem must be

¹ Page 1.

² Pages 1, 2.

³ Pages 2, 3.

to the westward of Rome, to avoid disturbance in the order of these mysteries?"¹

Then quoting Latin verses of Cowley² and English verses of Herbert,³ he says: "Not doubting but that these authorities, being brought to the king's scales, will be over weight."⁴

Afterwards he adduces "learned Mr. Nicholas Fuller," who "would fain have it believed that America was first peopled by the posterity of our great-grandfather Japheth, though he will not be very strict with us as to the particular branch of that wide family."⁵ The extract from this new authority is remarkable for its vindication to Columbus of the name of the new continent: "Quam passim *Americam* dicunt, vere ac merito *Columbinam* potius dicerent, a magnanimo heroë Christophoro Columbo Genuensi, primo terrarum illarum investigatore atque inventore plane divinitus constituto."⁶ This designation Fuller adopts: thus, "Hinc ergo *Co-*

¹ Page 31.

² "At tu præteritas tandem obliviscere clades:
Nam tanti non parva Deus tibi, America, vindex,
Et dedit et majora dabit solatia damni.
Gaude sorte tua: pars omnis amara vorata est
Jam dudum; dulcis superest. . . .
Ingenium, Pietas, Artes, ac Bellica Virtus
Huc profugæ venient, et regna illustria condent.
Et domina his Virtus erit, et Fortuna ministra."

Plantarum Lib. V. 1137-1200.

³ "Then shall Religion to America flee:
They have their times of Gospel, even as we."

The Church Militant, 247, 248.

⁴ Page 34.

⁵ Pages 49, 51.

⁶ "Which everywhere they call *America*; truly and deservedly they should say rather *Columbina*, from the magnanimous hero Christopher Columbus, the Genoese, first explorer, and plainly divinely appointed discoverer of those lands."—*Miscellanea Sacra*, Lib. II. cap. 4, *in fine*. Sewall, p. 49.

lumbina primum"; and again, "Multo is quidem propior est *Columbinæ*"; then again, "America, seu verius *Columbina*"; and yet again, "Repertam fuisse *Columbinam*." ¹ This effort draws from our prophet a comment:—

"But why should a learned man make all this *Dirige* for Columbus's name? What matter is it how America be called? For Flavio of Malphi in Naples hath in great measure applied the virtues of the loadstone to the mariner's compass in vain, the Portugals have found the length of Africa's foot in vain, the Spaniards sent out the Italian dove in vain, Sir Francis Drake hath sailed round the world and made thorow lights to it in vain, and Hakluyt and Purchas have with endless labor acquainted Englishmen with these things in vain, if, after all, we go about to turn the American Euphrates into a Stygian Lake. The breaking of this one instrument spoils us of the long-expected and much-desired consort of music." ²

Very soon thereafter he breaks forth in words printed in large Italic type and made prophetic:—

"*Lift up your heads, O ye Gates [of Columbina], and be ye lift up, ye Everlasting Doors, and the KING of Glory shall come in.*" ³

MARQUIS D'ARGENSON, 1733.

FROM the Puritan son of New England, pass now to a different character. René Louis de Voyer, Marquis d'Argenson, a French noble, was born 18th October, 1694, and died 26th January, 1757; so that his life

¹ Fuller, in *loc. cit.* Sewall, pp. 49, 50.

² Pages 50, 51.

³ Page 52.

lapped upon the prolonged reigns of Louis the Fourteenth and Louis the Fifteenth. At college the comrade of Voltaire, he was ever afterwards the friend and correspondent of this great writer. His own thoughts, commended by the style of the other, would have placed him among the most illustrious of French history. Notwithstanding strange eccentricities, he was often elevated, far-sighted, and prophetic, above any other Frenchman except Turgot. By the courtiers of Versailles he was called "the Stupid" (*la Bête*), while Voltaire hailed one of his productions, yet in manuscript, as the "work of Aristides," and pronounced him "the best citizen who had ever reached the ministry," and the Duc de Richelieu called him "Secretary of State for the Republic of Plato."¹

Except a brief subordinate service and two years of the Cabinet as Minister of Foreign Affairs, his life was passed in meditation and composition, especially on subjects of government and human improvement. This was his great passion. "If I were in power," he wrote, "and knew a capable man, I would go on all fours and seek him, to pray him to serve me as counsellor and tutor."² Is not this a lesson to the heedless partisan?

In 1725 he became an active member of a small club devoted to hardy speculation, and known, from its place of meeting at the apartment of its founder, as *l'Entre-Sol*. It is to his honor that he mingled here with the Abbé Saint-Pierre, and sympathized entirely with the many-sided, far-sighted plans of this "good man." In the privacy of his journal he records his homage: "This

¹ Voltaire à d'Argenson, 21 Juin, 1739. 13 Mars, 1750; à Richelieu, 4 Février, 1757: Œuvres de Voltaire, (1784-89,) Tom. LIII. p. 246; LIV. p. 225; LV. p. 406.

² Journal et Mémoires, Introduction, Tom. I. p. xlvii.

worthy citizen is not known, and he does not know himself. . . . He has much intelligence, and has devoted himself to a kind of philosophy profound and abandoned by everybody, which is the true politics destined to procure the greatest happiness of men.”¹ In praising Saint-Pierre our author furnished a measure of himself.

His “*Considérations sur le Gouvernement Ancien et Présent de la France*,” a work which excited the admiration both of Voltaire and Rousseau, was read by the former as early as 1739, but did not see the light till some years after the death of the author. It first appeared at Amsterdam in 1764, and in a short time there were no less than four editions in Holland. In 1784 a more accurate edition appeared in France, and in 1787 another at the command and expense of the Assembly of Notables. Here was a recognition of the people, and an inquiry how far democracy was consistent with monarchical government. Believing much in the people and anxious for their happiness, he had not ceased to believe in kings. The book was contained in the epigraph from the “*Britannicus*” of Racine:—

“Que dans le cours d’un règne florissant,
Rome soit toujours libre, et César tout-puissant.”

Other works followed: “*Essays in the Style of those of Montaigne*”; and the “*Journal and Memoirs*,” in nine volumes, published tardily. There still remain in manuscript: “*Remarks while Reading*”; “*Memoirs of State*”; “*Foreign Affairs, containing Memoirs of my Ministry*”; “*Thoughts since my Leaving the Ministry*”; and especially, “*Thoughts on the Reformation of the State.*” In all these there is a communicativeness like that of Saint-

¹ *Journal et Mémoires*, Février, 1731, Tom. I. p. 185.

Simon in his "Memoirs," and of Rousseau in his "Confessions," without the wonderful talent of either. The advanced ideas of the author are constantly conspicuous, making him foremost among contemporaries in discerning the questions of the future. Even of marriage he writes in the spirit of some modern reformers: "It is necessary to press the people to marriage, *waiting for something better.*"¹ This is an instance. His reforms embraced nothing less than the suppression of feudal privileges and of the right of primogeniture, uniformity of weights and measures, judges irremovable and salaried by the State, the dismissal of foreign troops, and the residence of the king and his ministers in the capital embellished by vast squares, pierced by broad streets, "with the *Bois de Boulogne* for country." This is the Paris of latter days. Add to this the suppression of cemeteries, hospitals, and slaughter-houses in the interior of Paris, — and many other things, not omitting omnibuses, and even including balloons. "Here is something," he records, "which will be treated as folly. I am persuaded that one of the first famous discoveries to make, and reserved perhaps for our age, is to find the art of flying in the air." And he proceeds to describe the balloon.²

His large nature is manifest in cosmopolitan ideas, and the inquiry if it were not well to consider one's self "as citizen of the world" more than is the usage. Here his soul glows: —

"What a small corner Europe occupies on the round earth! How many lands remain to be inhabited! See this immense extent of three parts of the world, and of undiscovered lands

¹ Journal et Mémoires, Introduction, Tom. I. p. xxvii.

² Ibid., p. liv, note.

at the North and South! If people went there with other views than that tiresome exclusive property, all these lands would be inhabited in two centuries. We shall not see this, but it will come.”¹

And then, after coupling morals and well-being, he announces the true rule: “An individual who shall do well will succeed, and who shall do ill will fail: *it is the same with nations.*”² This is just and lofty. In such a spirit he cherished plans of political reconstruction in foreign nations, especially in Italy. The old Italian cry was his: “The Barbarians must be driven from Italy”; and he contemplated “a republic or eternal association of the Italian powers, as there was a German, a Dutch, an Helvetic,” and he called this “the greatest affair that had been treated in Europe for a long time.” The entry of Italy was to be closed to the Emperor; and he adds: “For ourselves what a happy privation, if we are excluded forever from the necessity of sending thither our armies to triumph, but to perish!”³

The intelligence that saw Italy so clearly saw France also, and her exigencies, marking out “a national senate composed equally of all the orders of the state, and which, on questions of peace and war, would hold the kings in check by the necessity of obtaining supplies”; also saw the approaching decay of Turkey, and wished to make Greece flourishing once more, to acquire possession of the holy places, to overcome the barbarians of Northern Africa by a union of Christian powers, which,

¹ Journal et Mémoires, Introduction, Tom. I. p. xxxiii.

² Ibid., p. xxxiv.

³ Sainte-Beuve, Causeries du Lundi, Tom. XII. p. 105: *Le Marquis d'Argenson*. Journal et Mémoires, Introduction, Tom. I. p. xxxvii.

"once well united in a kind of Christian Republic, according to the project of Henry the Fourth detailed by the Abbé Saint-Pierre, would have something better to do than fighting to destroy each other as they now do."¹ Naturally this singular precocious intelligence reached across the Atlantic, and here he became one of our prophets:—

"Another great event to arrive upon the round earth is this. The English have in North America domains great, strong, rich, well regulated. There are in New England a parliament, governors, troops, white inhabitants in abundance, riches, and, what is worse, a marine.

"I say that some fine morning these dominions may separate from England, rise and erect themselves into an independent republic.

"What will happen then? Do people think of this? A country civilized by the arts of Europe, in a condition to communicate with it by the present perfection of its marine, and which will thus appropriate our arts in proportion to their improvement, — patience! such a country in several centuries will make great progress in population and in refinement; such a country in a short time will render itself master of America, and especially of the gold-mines."

Then, dwelling on the extension of commercial freedom and the improvement of the means of communication, he exclaims, with lyrical outburst: —

"And you will then see how beautiful the earth will be! what culture! what new arts and new sciences! what safety for commerce! Navigation will precipitate all nations towards each other. A day will come when one will go about

¹ Journal et Mémoires, Tom. I., Introduction, p. xliii; Appendice, p. 363.

in a populous and orderly city of California as one goes in the stage-coach of Meaux."¹

The published works of D'Argenson do not enable us to fix the precise date of these remarkable words. They are from the "Thoughts on the Reformation of the State," and the first three paragraphs appear to have been written as early at least as 1733, while his intimacy with the Abbé Saint-Pierre was at its height; the fourth somewhat later;² but all preceding Turgot and John Adams. Each, however, spoke from his own soul, and without prompting.

TURGOT, 1750, 1770, 1776, 1778.

AMONG the illustrious names of France few equal that of Turgot. He was a philosopher among ministers, and a minister among philosophers. Malesherbes said of him, that he had the heart of L'Hôpital and the head of Bacon. Such a person in public affairs was an epoch for his country and for the human race. Had his spirit prevailed, the bloody drama of the French Revolution would not have occurred, or it would at least have been postponed: I think it could not have occurred. He was a good man, who sought to carry into government the rules of goodness. His career from beginning to end was one continuous beneficence. Such a nature was essentially prophetic, for he discerned the natural laws by which the future is governed.

He was of an ancient Norman family, whose name suggests the god Thor. He was born at Paris, 1727, and

¹ *Pensées sur la Réformation de l'État: Journal et Mémoires*, Introduction, Tom. I. pp. lv, lvi.

² *Ibid.* Compare p. lvi, notes 1 and 2; p. iv, note 2; and p. xvii, note.

died, 1781. Being a younger son, he was destined for the Church, and began his studies as an ecclesiastic at the ancient Sorbonne. Before registering an irrevocable vow, he announced his repugnance to the profession, and turned aside to other pursuits. Law, literature, science, humanity, government, now engaged his attention. He associated himself with the authors of the "Encyclopédie," and became one of its contributors. In other writings he vindicated especially the virtue of Toleration. Not merely a theorist, he soon arrived at the high post of Intendant of Limoges, where he developed talent for administration and sympathy with the people. The potato came into Limousin through him. But he continued to employ his pen, particularly on questions of political economy, which he treated as a master. On the accession of Louis the Sixteenth he was called to the Cabinet as Minister of the Marine, and shortly afterwards gave up this place to be the head of the Finances. Here he began a system of rigid economy, founded on curtailment of expenses and enlargement of resources. The latter was obtained especially by removal of disabilities from trade, whether at home or abroad, and the substitution of a single tax on land for a complex multiplicity of taxes. The enemies of progress were too strong at that time, and the King dismissed the reformer. Good men in France became anxious for the future; Voltaire, in his distant retreat, gave a shriek of despair, and addressed to Turgot remarkable verses entitled "Épître à un Homme." Worse still, the good edicts of the minister were rescinded, and society was put back.

The discarded minister gave himself to science, literature, and friendship. He welcomed Franklin to

France and to immortality in a Latin verse of marvellous felicity. He was already the companion of the liberal spirits who were doing so much for knowledge and for reform. By writing and by conversation he exercised a constant influence. His "ideas" seem to illumine the time. We may be content to follow him in saying, "The glory of arms cannot compare with the happiness of living in peace."¹ He anticipated our definition of a republic, when he said "it was founded upon *the equality of all the citizens*,"²—good words, not yet practically verified in all our States. Such a government he, living under a monarchy, bravely pronounced "the best of all"; but he added, that he "never had known a constitution truly republican."³ With similar plainness he announced that "the destruction of the Ottoman Empire would be a real good for all the nations of Europe," and he added, still further, for humanity also, because it would involve the abolition of negro slavery, and because "to despoil an oppressor is not to attack, but to vindicate, the common rights of humanity."⁴ With such thoughts and aspirations the prophet died.

But I have no purpose of writing a biography, or even a character. All that I intend is an introduction to Turgot's prophetic words. When only twenty-three years of age, while still an ecclesiastic at the Sorbonne, the future minister delivered a discourse on the Progress of the Human Mind, in which, after describing

¹ Letter to Dr. Price, March 22, 1778 : Price's *Observations on the Importance of the American Revolution*, (London, 1785,) App., p. 98.

² *Ibid.*, p. 93.

³ Condorcet, *Vie de Turgot : Œuvres*, éd. O'Connor et Arago, (Paris, 1847-49,) Tom. V. p. 209.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

the commercial triumphs of the ancient Phœnicians, covering the coasts of Greece and Asia with their colonies, he lets drop these remarkable words:—

“Les colonies sont comme des fruits qui ne tiennent à l'arbre que jusqu'à leur maturité : devenues suffisantes à elles-mêmes, elles firent ce que fit depuis Carthage, — *ce que fera un jour l'Amérique.*”

“Colonies are like fruits, which hold to the tree only until their maturity : when sufficient for themselves, they did that which Carthage afterwards did, — *that which some day America will do.*”¹

On this most suggestive declaration, Dupont de Nemours, the editor of Turgot's works in 1808, remarks in a note:—

“It was in 1750 that M. Turgot, being then only twenty-three years old, and devoted in a seminary to the study of theology, divined, foresaw, the revolution which has formed the United States, — which has detached them from the European power apparently the most capable of retaining its colonies under its dominion.”

At the time Turgot wrote, Canada was a French possession ; but his words are as applicable to this colony as to the United States. When will the fruit be ripe ?

In contrast with this precise prediction, and yet in harmony with it, are the words of Montesquieu, in his ingenious work, which saw the light in 1748, two years before the discourse of Turgot. In the famous chapter, “How the laws contribute to form the manners, customs, and character of a nation,” we have a much-

¹ Œuvres, éd. Dupont de Nemours, (Paris, 1808-11,) Tom. II. p. 66. Ibid., éd. Daire, (Paris, 1844,) Tom. II. p. 602.

admired picture of "a free nation" "inhabiting an island," where, without naming England, it is easy to recognize her greatness and glory. And here we meet a Delphic passage, also without a name, pointing to the British Colonies : —

"If this nation sent out colonies, it would do so more to extend its commerce than its dominion.

"As people like to establish elsewhere what is found established at home, it would give to the people of its colonies its own form of government ; and this government carrying with it prosperity, *we should see great peoples formed in the very forests which it should send to inhabit.*"¹

The future greatness of the Colonies is insinuated rather than foretold, and here the prophetic voice is silent. Nothing is said of the impending separation, and the beginning of a new nation ; so that, plainly, Montesquieu saw our future less than Turgot.

The youthful prophet did not lose his penetrating vision with years. In the same spirit and with immense vigor he wrote to the English philosopher, Josiah Tucker, September 12, 1770 : —

"As a citizen of the world, I see with joy the approach of an event which, more than all the books of the philosophers, will dissipate the phantom of commercial jealousy. *I speak of the separation of your colonies from the mother country, WHICH WILL SOON BE FOLLOWED BY THAT OF ALL AMERICA FROM EUROPE.* It is then that the discovery of this part of the world will become truly useful to us. It is then that it will multiply our enjoyments much more abundantly than when we purchased them with torrents of blood. The English, the French, the Spaniards, etc., will use sugar, coffee,

¹ De l'Esprit des Lois, Liv. XIX. ch. 27.

indigo, and will sell their products, precisely as the Swiss do to-day ; and they will also, like the Swiss people, have the advantage, that this sugar, this coffee, this indigo will no longer serve as a pretext for intriguers to precipitate their nation into ruinous wars and to oppress them with taxes.”¹

It is impossible not to feel in this passage the sure grasp of our American destiny. How clearly and courageously he announces the inevitable future ! But the French philosopher-statesman again took the tripod.

This was in the discharge of his duties as minister of the Crown, and in reply to a special application. His noble opinion is dated 6th April, 1776. Its character appears in a few sentences : —

“The present war will probably end in the absolute independence of the Colonies, and that event will certainly be *the epoch of the greatest revolution in the commerce and politics, not of England only, but of all Europe*. . . . When the English themselves shall recognize the independence of their colonies, *every mother country will be forced* in like manner to exchange its dominion over its colonies for bonds of friendship and fraternity. . . . When *the total separation of America* shall have cured the European nations of commercial jealousy, there will exist among men one great cause of war the less ; and it is very difficult not to desire an event which is to accomplish this good for the human race.”²

His letter to the English Dr. Price, on the American Constitutions, abounds in profound observations and in prophecy. It was written just at the time when France openly joined against England in our War of Independence, and is dated March 22, 1778, but did not see the

¹ Œuvres, éd. Daire, Tom. II. p. 802.

² Ibid., pp. 557, 581, 564. Bancroft, History of the United States, Vol. VIII. pp. 337, 338.

light until 1784, some years after the death of the author, when it was published by Dr. Price.¹ Its criticism of the American Constitutions aroused John Adams to his elaborate work in their "Defence."²

Of our Union before the adoption of the National Constitution he writes:—

"In the general union of the provinces among themselves I do not see a coalition, a fusion of all the parts, making but one body, one and homogeneous. It is only an aggregation of parts always too much separated, and preserving always a tendency to division, by the diversity of their laws, their manners, their opinions, — by the inequality of their actual forces, — still more by the inequality of their ulterior progress. It is only a copy of the Dutch Republic: but this Republic had not to fear, as the American Republic has, the possible enlargement of some of its provinces. This whole edifice has been supported hitherto on the false basis of the very ancient and very vulgar policy: on the prejudice that nations and provinces, as bodies, can have interests other than that which individuals have to be free and to defend their property against brigands and conquerors; a pretended interest to carry on more commerce than others, — not to buy the merchandise of the foreigner, but to force the foreigner to consume their productions and their manufactures; a pretended interest to have a vaster territory, to acquire such or such a province, such or such an island, such or such a vilage; an interest to inspire fear in other nations; an interest to surpass them in the glory of arms, and in that of arts and sciences."³

Among the evils to be overcome are, in the Southern

¹ Observations on the Importance of the American Revolution, Appendix.

² Works, Vols. IV. – VI., where (IV. 278 – 281) is found the larger part of the letter of Turgot.

³ Price, Observations on the Importance of the American Revolution, App., pp. 96, 97. Turgot, Œuvres, éd. Daire, Tom. II. p. 808.

Colonies, too great an inequality of fortunes, and especially the large number of black slaves, whose slavery is incompatible with a good political constitution, and who, even when restored to liberty, will cause embarrassment by forming two nations in the same State. In all the Colonies he deprecates prejudice, attachment to established forms, a habit of certain taxes, fear of those which it might be necessary to substitute, the vanity of the Colonies who deem themselves most powerful, and the wretched beginning of national pride. Happily he adds: "I think the Americans destined to aggrandizement, not by war, but by husbandry."¹ And he then proceeds to his aspirations: —

"It is impossible not to desire earnestly that this people may attain to all the prosperity of which they are capable. They are the hope of the human race. They can become its model. They are to prove to the world, by the fact, that men can be free and tranquil, and can dispense with the chains of all kinds which the tyrants and charlatans of every cloth have pretended to impose under the pretext of the public good. They are to give the example of political liberty, of religious liberty, of commercial and industrial liberty. The asylum which they open to all the oppressed of all nations is to console the earth. The facility thereby afforded for escape from a bad government will force the European governments to be just and enlightened. The rest of the world, little by little, will open their eyes to the nothingness of the illusions in which politicians have indulged. To this end it is necessary that America should guard against them, and should not again become, as your ministerial writers have so often repeated, an image of our Europe, *a mass of divided powers*, disputing about territory or commercial prof-

¹ Price, Observations on the Importance of the American Revolution, App., p. 100. Turgot, Œuvres, éd. Daire, Tom. II. p. 809.

its, and continually cementing the slavery of the peoples with their own blood.”¹

After these admirable thoughts, so full of wisdom and prophecy, Turgot alludes to the impending war between France and England:—

“Our two nations are going to do each other reciprocally much evil, probably without either of them obtaining any real advantage. The increase of debts and charges and the ruin of a great many citizens will be, perhaps, the only result. England seems to me even nearer to this than France. If instead of this war you had been able to yield with good grace from the first moment, — if it had been given to policy to do in advance what infallibly it will be forced to do later, — if national opinion could have permitted your Government to anticipate events, — and, supposing that it had foreseen them, it had been able to consent at once to the independence of America without making war on anybody, — I firmly believe that your nation would have lost nothing by this change. It will lose now what it has already expended, and what it shall yet expend. It will experience for some time a great falling off in its commerce, great domestic disturbances, if it is forced to bankruptcy, and, whatever may happen, a great diminution of political influence abroad. But this last matter is of very small importance to the real welfare of a people; and I am not at all of the opinion of the Abbé Raynal in your motto.² I do not believe that this will make you a contemptible nation, and throw you into slavery. On the contrary, your troubles will perhaps have the effect of a

¹ Price, *Observations on the Importance of the American Revolution*, App., pp. 102, 103. Turgot, *Œuvres*, éd. Daire, Tom. II. pp. 809, 810.

² “Should the morals of the English be perverted by luxury, should they lose their colonies by restraining them, &c., they will be enslaved, they will become insignificant and contemptible; and Europe will not be able to show the world one nation in which she can pride herself.” — Motto on title-page of Price’s second tract on Civil Liberty, from Raynal, *Histoire Philosophique et Politique*, Liv. XIX.

necessary amputation ; they are perhaps the only means of saving you from the gangrene of luxury and corruption. If in your agitations you could correct your Constitution by rendering the elections annual, by apportioning the right of representation in a manner more equal and more proportioned to the interests of those represented, you would gain from this revolution as much, perhaps, as America ; for your liberty would remain to you, and with this and by this your other losses would be very speedily repaired.”¹

Reading such words, the heart throbs and the pulse beats. Government inspired by such a spirit would become divine, nations would live at peace together, and people everywhere be happy.

HORACE WALPOLE, 1754, 1774, 1777, 1779.

MOST unlike Turgot in character, but with something of the same spirit of prophecy, and associated in time, was Horace Walpole, youngest son of England's remarkable Prime Minister, Sir Robert Walpole. With the former, life was serious always, and human improvement the perpetual passion ; with the latter, there was a constant desire for amusement, and the world was little more than a curious gimcrack.

Horace Walpole was born 5th October, 1717, and died 2d March, 1797, being at his death Earl of Orford. According to his birth he was a man of fashion ; for a time a member of Parliament ; a man of letters always. To his various talents he added an aggregation of miscellaneous tastes, of which his house at Strawberry Hill was an illustration, — being an elegant

¹ Price, *Observations on the Importance of the American Revolution*, App., pp. 103–105. Turgot, *Œuvres*, éd. Daire, Tom. II. p. 810.

"Old Curiosity Shop," with pictures, books, manuscripts, prints, armor, china, historic relics, and art in all its forms, which he had collected at no small outlay of time and money. Though aristocratic in life, he boasted that his principles were not monarchical. On the two sides of his bed were hung engravings of Magna Charta and the Sentence of Charles the First, the latter with the inscription "*Major Charta.*" Sleeping between two such memorials, he might be suspected of sympathy with America, although the aristocrat was never absent. His Memoirs, Journals, Anecdotes of Painting in England, and other works, are less famous than his multifarious correspondence, which is the best in English literature, and, according to French judgment, nearer than any other in our language to that of Madame de Sévigné, whom he never wearied in praising. It is free, easy, gossipy, historic, and spicy.

But I deal with him now only as a prophet. And I begin with his "Memoires of the last Ten Years of the Reign of George the Second," where we find the record that the Colonists were seeking independence. This occurs in his description of the Duke of Newcastle as Secretary of State for the Colonies, during the long Walpole administration. Illustrating what he calls the Duke's "mercurial inattention," he says: "It would not be credited what reams of papers, representations, memorials, petitions from that quarter of the world [the Colonies], lay mouldering and unopened in his office"; and then, showing the Duke's ignorance, he narrates how, when it was hinted that there should be some defence for Annapolis, he replied, with evasive, lisping hurry: "Aanapolis, Annapolis! Oh, yes, Annapolis must be defended, — to be sure, Annapolis

should be defended ; — where is Annapolis ? ” But this negligence did not prevent him from exalting the prerogative of the Crown ; and here the author says : —

“ The instructions to Sir Danvers Osborn, a new governor of New York, seemed better calculated for the latitude of Mexico and for a Spanish tribunal than for a free, rich British settlement, and in such opulence and of such haughtiness that *suspicious had long been conceived of their meditating to throw off their dependence on their mother country.* ” ¹

This stands in the “ *Memoires* ” under the date of 1754, and the editor in a note observes, “ If, as the author asserts, this was written at the time, it is a very remarkable passage. ” By direction of the author the book was “ to be kept unopened and unsealed ” until a certain person named should attain the age of twenty-five years. It was published in 1822. Perhaps the honesty of this entry will be better appreciated, when it is noted, that, only a few pages later, Washington, whom the author afterwards admired, is spoken of as “ this brave braggart ” who “ learned to blush for his *rodomontade.* ” ²

As the difficulties with the Colonies increased, he became more sympathetic and prophetic. In a letter to Sir Horace Mann, 2d February, 1774, he wrote : —

“ We have no news, public or private ; but there is an ostrich-egg laid in America, where the Bostonians have canted three hundred chests of tea into the ocean ; for they will not drink tea with our Parliament. . . . Lord Chatham talked of conquering America in Germany. *I believe Eng-*

¹ *Memoires*, Vol. I. p. 344.

² *Ibid.*, p. 347. See also Letter to Sir Horace Mann, October 6, 1754 : *Letters*, ed. Cunningham, Vol. II. p. 398.

*land will be conquered some day or other in New England or Bengal."*¹

In May, 1774, his sympathies again appear:—

"Nothing was more shocking than the King's laughing and saying at his levee *that he had as lief fight the Bostonians as the French*. It was only to be paralleled by James the Second sporting on Jeffreys's 'campaign in the West.'"²

And under date of 28th May, 1775, we have his record of the encounter at Lexington, with the reflection:—

"Thus was the civil war begun, and a victory the first fruits of it on the side of the Americans, whom Lord Sandwich had had the folly and rashness to proclaim cowards."³

His letters to the Countess of Ossory, written during the war, show his irrepressible sentiments. Thus, under date of 9th November, 1775:—

"I think this country undone almost beyond redemption. Victory in any war but a civil one fascinates mankind with a vision of glory. What should we gain by triumph itself? Would America laid waste, deluged with blood, plundered, enslaved, replace America flourishing, rich, and free? Do we want to reign over it, as the Spaniards over Peru, depopulated? Are desolate regions preferable to commercial cities?"⁴

Then under date of 6th July, 1777:—

¹ Letters, ed. Cunningham, Vol. VI. p. 57.

² Journal of the Reign of George III. from 1771 to 1783, ed. Doran, Vol. I. p. 366.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 491. See Speech of Earl of Sandwich in the House of Lords, March 15, 1775: Hansard's Parliamentary History, Vol. XVIII. col. 446.

⁴ Letters, ed. Cunningham, Vol. VI. p. 279.

"My humble opinion is, that we shall never recover America, and that France will take care that we shall never recover ourselves."¹

"Friday night, late," 5th December, 1777, he breaks forth:—

"Send for Lord Chatham! They had better send for General Washington, Madam,—or at least for our troops back. . . . No, Madam, we do not want ministers that would protract our difficulties. I look on them but as beginning now, and am far from thinking that there is any man or set of men able enough to extricate us. *I own there are very able Englishmen left, but they happen to be on t'other side of the Atlantic.* If his Majesty hopes to find them here, I doubt he will be mistaken."²

"Thursday night," 11th December, 1777, his feelings overflow in no common language:—

"Was ever proud, insolent nation sunk so low? Burke and Charles Fox told him [Lord North] the Administration thought of nothing but keeping their places; and so they will, and the members their pensions, and the nation its infamy. Were I Franklin, I would order the Cabinet Council to come to me at Paris with ropes about their necks, and then kick them back to St. James's.

"Well, Madam, as I told Lord Ossory t'other day, I am satisfied: *Old England is safe,—that is, America, whither the true English retired under Charles the First:* this is Nova Scotia, and I care not what becomes of it. . . . Adieu, Madam! I am at last not sorry you have no son; and your daughters, I hope, will be married to Americans, and not in this dirty, despicable island."³

¹ Letters, ed. Cunningham, Vol. VI. p. 450.

² Ibid., Vol. VII. pp. 12, 13.

³ Ibid., pp. 14, 15.

All this is elevated by his letter of 17th February, 1779, where he says:—

“Liberty has still a continent to exist in. I do not care a straw who is Minister in this abandoned country. It is *the good old cause of Freedom* that I have at heart.”¹

Thus with constancy, where original principle was doubtless quickened by party animosity, did Horace Walpole maintain the American cause and predict a new home for Liberty.

JOHN ADAMS, 1755, 1765, 1776, 1780, 1785, 1787, 1813, 1818.

NEXT in time among the prophets was John Adams, who has left on record at different dates predictions showing a second-sight of no common order. Of his life I need say nothing, except that he was born 19th October, 1735, and died 4th July, 1826. I mention the predictions in the order of utterance.

1. While teaching a school at Worcester, and when under twenty years of age, he wrote a letter to one of his youthful companions, bearing date 12th October, 1755, which is a marvel of foresight. Fifty-two years afterwards, when already much of its prophecy had been fulfilled, the original was returned to its author by the son of his early comrade and correspondent, Nathan Webb, who was at the time dead. After remarking gravely on the rise and fall of nations, with illustrations from Carthage and Rome, he proceeds:—

“England began to increase in power and magnificence, and is now the greatest nation upon the globe. Soon after

¹ Letters, ed. Cunningham, Vol. VII. pp. 176, 177.

the Reformation, a few people came over into this New World for conscience' sake. Perhaps this apparently trivial incident *may transfer the great seat of empire into America. It looks likely to me:* for, if we can remove the turbulent Gallics, our people, according to the exactest computations, will in another century become more numerous than England itself. Should this be the case, since we have, I may say, all the naval stores of the nations in our hands, it will be easy to obtain the mastery of the seas; and then the united force of all Europe will not be able to subdue us. The only way to keep us from setting up for ourselves is to disunite us. *Divide et impera.* Keep us in distinct colonies, and then some great men in each colony desiring the monarchy of the whole, they will destroy each other's influence, and keep the country *in equilibrio*.¹

On this his son, John Quincy Adams, famous for important service and high office, remarks:—

“Had the political part of it been written by the minister of state of a European monarchy, at the close of a long life spent in the government of nations, it would have been pronounced worthy of the united penetration and experience of a Burleigh, a Sully, or an Oxenstiern. . . . *In one bold outline he has exhibited by anticipation a long succession of prophetic history, the fulfilment of which is barely yet in progress, responding exactly hitherto to his foresight, but the full accomplishment of which is reserved for the development of after ages.* The extinction of the power of France in America, the union of the British North American Colonies, the achievement of their independence, and the establishment of their ascendancy in the community of civilized nations by the means of their naval power, are all foreshadowed in this letter, with a clearness of perception and a distinctness of

¹ Works, Vol. I. pp. 23, 24. See also Vol. IX. pp. 591–593.

delineation which time has hitherto done little more than to convert into historical fact."¹

2. Another beautiful instance followed ten years later. In the beginning of 1765, Jeremy Gridley, the eminent lawyer of Colonial days, formed a law club, or Sodality, at Boston, for the mutual improvement of its members. Here John Adams produced the original sketch of his "Dissertation on the Canon and Feudal Law," which appeared in the "Boston Gazette" of August, 1765, was immediately and repeatedly reprinted in London, and afterwards in Philadelphia.² The sketch began:—

"This Sodality has given rise to the following speculation of my own, which I commit to writing as hints for future inquiries rather than as a satisfactory theory."³

In this Dissertation, the writer dwells especially upon the settlers of British America, of whom he says:—

"After their arrival here, they began their settlement, and formed their plan, both of ecclesiastical and civil government, in direct opposition to the canon and the feudal systems."⁴

This excellent statement was followed, in the original sketch communicated to the Sodality, by this passage, which does not appear in the printed Dissertation:—

"I always consider the settlement of America with reverence and wonder, as the opening of a grand scene and design in Providence for the illumination of the ignorant and the emancipation of the slavish part of mankind all over the earth."⁵

¹ Works, Vol. I. pp. 24-26.

² Ibid., Vol. III. p. 447.

³ Ibid., Vol. I. p. 66.

⁴ Ibid., Vol. III. p. 451.

⁵ Ibid., Vol. I. p. 66; Vol. III. p. 452.

On these prophetic words, his son, John Quincy Adams, remarks:—

“This sentence was perhaps omitted from an impression that it might be thought to savor not merely of enthusiasm, but of extravagance. Who now would deny that this magnificent anticipation has been already to a great degree realized? Who does not now see that the accomplishment of this great object is already placed beyond all possibility of failure?”¹

His grandson, Charles Francis Adams, alluding to the changes which took place in the original sketch, says:—

“As not infrequently happens, however, in this process, one strong passage was lost by it, which at this time must be regarded as the most deserving of any to be remembered.”²

Thus again, at an early day, did this prophet discern the future. How true it is that the mission of this Republic is “the illumination of the ignorant,” and, still further, “the emancipation of the slavish part of mankind all over the earth”! Universal enlightenment and universal emancipation! And the first great stage was National Independence.

3. The Declaration of Independence bears date 4th July, 1776, for on that day it was signed; but the vote which determined it was on the 2d July. On the 3d July, John Adams, in a letter to his wife, wrote:—

“Yesterday the greatest question was decided which ever was debated in America; and a greater, perhaps, never was nor will be decided among men. . . . I am surprised at the

¹ Works, Vol. I. p. 66.

² Ibid., Vol. III. p. 448.

suddenness as well as greatness of this revolution. Britain has been filled with folly, and America with wisdom. At least this is my judgment. Time must determine. *It is the will of Heaven that the two countries should be sundered forever. . . .* The day is passed. The second day of July, 1776, will be the most memorable epocha in the history of America. *I am apt to believe that it will be celebrated by succeeding generations as the great anniversary festival.* It ought to be commemorated, as the day of deliverance, by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, games, sports, guns, bells, bonfires, and illuminations, from one end of this continent to the other, from this time forward, forevermore. You will think me transported with enthusiasm, but I am not. I am well aware of the toil and blood and treasure that it will cost us to maintain this Declaration, and support and defend these States. *Yet, through all the gloom, I can see the rays of ravishing light and glory. I can see that the end is more than worth all the means, and that posterity will triumph in that day's transaction, even although we should rue it, which I trust in God we shall not."*¹

Here is a comprehensive prophecy, first, that the two countries would be separated forever; secondly, that the anniversary of Independence would be celebrated as a great annual festival; and, thirdly, that posterity would triumph in this transaction, where, through all the gloom, shone rays of ravishing light and glory: all of which has been fulfilled to the letter. Recent events give to the Declaration additional importance. For a long time its great premises, that all men are equal, and that rightful government stands only on the consent of the governed, were disowned by our country. Now that at last they are beginning to prevail, there

¹ Works, Vol. I. pp. 230, 232.

is increased reason to celebrate the day on which the mighty Declaration was made, and new occasion for triumph in the rays of ravishing light and glory.

4. Here is another prophetic passage, in a letter dated at Paris, 13th July, 1780, and addressed to the Comte de Vergennes of France, pleading the cause of the Colonists:—

“The United States of America are a great and powerful people, whatever European statesmen may think of them. If we take into our estimate the numbers and the character of her people, the extent, variety, and fertility of her soil, her commerce, and her skill and materials for ship-building, and her seamen, excepting France, Spain, England, Germany, and Russia, there is not a state in Europe so powerful. Breaking off such a nation as this from the English so suddenly, and uniting it so closely with France, is one of the most extraordinary events that ever happened among mankind.”¹

Perhaps this may be considered statement rather than prophecy; but it illustrates the prophetic character of the writer.

5. While at Amsterdam, in 1780, Mr. Adams met a gentleman whom he calls “the giant of the law,” Mr. Calkoen. After an unsatisfactory attempt at conversation, where neither spoke the language of the other, it was arranged that the latter should propound a series of questions in writing, which the American minister undertook to answer. The questions were in Dutch, the answers in English. Among the questions was this: “Whether America in and of itself, by means of purchasing or exchanging the productions of the sev-

¹ Works, Vol. VII. pp. 226, 227.

eral provinces, would be able to continue the war for six, eight, or ten years, even if they were entirely deprived of the trade with Europe, or their allies, exhausted by the war and forced to make a separate peace, were to leave them?" To this question our prophet replied:—

"This is an extreme case. . . . Why, then, should we put cases that we know can never happen? However, I can inform you that the case was often put before this war broke out; and I have heard the common farmers in America reasoning upon these cases seven years ago. I have heard them say, if Great Britain could build a wall of brass a thousand feet high all along the sea-coast, at low-water mark, we can live and be happy. *America is most undoubtedly capable of being the most independent country upon earth.* It produces everything for the necessity, comfort, and conveniency of life, and many of the luxuries too. So that, if there were an eternal separation between Europe and America, the inhabitants of America would not only live, but multiply, and, for what I know, be wiser, better, and happier than they will be as it is."¹

Here is an assertion of conditions essential to independence of "the most independent country upon earth," with a promise that the inhabitants will multiply.

6. In an official letter to the President of Congress, dated at Amsterdam, 5th September, 1780, the same writer, while proposing an American Academy "for refining, correcting, improving, and ascertaining the English language," predicts the extension of this language:—

¹ Twenty-Six Letters upon Interesting Subjects respecting the Revolution of America, written in Holland in the Year 1780: Works, Vol. VII. pp. 274, 275.

*“English is destined to be in the next and succeeding centuries more generally the language of the world than Latin was in the last or French is in the present age. The reason of this is obvious, — because the increasing population in America, and their universal connection and correspondence with all nations, will, aided by the influence of England in the world, whether great or small, force their language into general use, in spite of all the obstacles that may be thrown in their way, if any such there should be.”*¹

In another letter, of unofficial character, dated at Amsterdam, 23d September, 1780, he thus repeats his prophecy: —

*“You must know I have undertaken to prophesy that English will be the most respectable language in the world, and the most universally read and spoken, in the next century, if not before the close of this. American population will in the next age produce a greater number of persons who will speak English than any other language, and these persons will have more general acquaintance and conversation with all other nations than any other people.”*²

David Hume, in a letter to Gibbon, 24th October, 1767, had already written: —

*“Our solid and increasing establishments in America, where we need less dread the inundation of Barbarians, promise a superior stability and duration to the English language.”*³

But these more moderate words, which did credit to the discernment of the philosopher-historian, were then unpublished.

¹ Works, Vol. VII. p. 250.

² Letter to Edmund Jenings: Ibid., Vol. IX. pp. 509, 510.

³ Gibbon, Life, ed. Milman, (London, 1839,) p. 231, Chap. VII., Notes and Additions.

The prophecy of John Adams is already accomplished. Of all the European languages, English is most extensively spoken. Through England and the United States it has become the language of commerce, which sooner or later must embrace the globe. The German philologist, Grimm, has followed our American prophet in saying that it "seems chosen, like its people, to rule in future times in a still greater degree in all the corners of the earth." ¹

7. Another field was opened by a European correspondent, John Luzac, who writes from Leyden, under date of 14th September, 1780, that, in pleading the cause of American Independence, he has twenty times encountered, from sensible and educated people, an objection which he sets forth as follows:—

"Yes, but if America becomes free, she will some day give the law to Europe. She will take our islands, and our colonies at Guiana; she will seize all the Antilles; she will absorb Mexico, even Peru, Chili, and Brazil; she will carry off our freighting commerce; she will pay her benefactors with ingratitude." ²

To this Mr. Adams replied, in a letter from Amsterdam, 15th September, 1780:—

"I have met often in Europe with the same species of reasoners that you describe; but I find they are not numerous. Among men of reflection the sentiment is generally different, and that no power in Europe has anything to fear from America. The principal interest of America for many centuries to come will be landed, and her chief occupation

¹ Alexander Keith Johnston, *Physical Atlas*, (edit. 1856,) p. 114, note.

² Works of John Adams, Vol. VII. p. 254.

agriculture. Manufactures and commerce will be but secondary objects, and always subservient to the other. America will be the country to produce raw materials for manufactures, but Europe will be the country of manufactures; and the commerce of America can never increase but in a certain proportion to the growth of its agriculture, until its whole territory of land is filled up with inhabitants, which will not be in some hundreds of years."

After referring to tar, iron, and timber as American articles, he says:—

"In fact, the Atlantic is so long and difficult a navigation, that the Americans will never be able to afford to carry to the European market great quantities of these articles."

If the prophet fails here, he is none the less wise in the suggestion with which he closes:—

"If Europe cannot prevent, or rather if any particular nations of Europe cannot prevent, the independence of America, then the sooner her independence is acknowledged, the better,—the less likely she will be to become warlike, enterprising, and ambitious. The truth is, however, that America can never unite in any war but a defensive one."¹

Had the prophet foreseen the increasing facilities of commerce, the triumphs of steam, the floating masses of transportation, the wonders of navigation, quickened and guided by the telegraph, and to these had he added the diversified industry of the country, extending, expanding, and prevailing, his remarkable vision, which already saw so much, would have viewed other glories in assured certainty.

8. There is another prophecy, at once definite and

¹ Works, Vol. VII. pp. 255, 256.

broad, from the same eminent quarter. In a letter dated London, 17th October, 1785, and addressed to John Jay, at the time Secretary for Foreign Affairs under the Confederation, John Adams reveals his conviction of the importance of France to us, "while England held a province in America";¹ and then, in another letter, dated 21st October, 1785, reports the saying of people about him, "*that Canada and Nova Scotia must soon be ours*; there must be a war for it, —they know how it will end,—but the sooner, the better; this done, we shall be forever at peace,—till then, never."² These intimations foreshadow the prophecy found in the Preface to his "Defence of the American Constitutions," written in London, while minister there, and dated Grosvenor Square, 1st January, 1787:—

"The United States of America have exhibited, perhaps, the first example of governments erected on the simple principles of Nature. . . . Thirteen governments thus founded on the natural authority of the people alone, without a pretence of miracle or mystery, and *which are destined to spread over the northern part of that whole quarter of the globe*, are a great point gained in favor of the rights of mankind. The experiment is made, and has completely succeeded."³

Here is foretold nothing less than that our system of government is to embrace the whole continent of North America.

9. This series may be concluded by other words, general in character, but deeply prophetic, showing a

¹ Works, Vol. VIII. p. 322.

³ Ibid., Vol. IV. pp. 292, 293.

² Ibid., p. 333.

constant sense of the unfolding grandeur and influence of the Republic.

The first is from the concluding chapter of the work last cited, and in harmony with the Preface:—

“A prospect into futurity in America is like contemplating the heavens through the telescopes of Herschel. Objects stupendous in their magnitudes and motions strike us from all quarters, and fill us with amazement.”¹

Thus, also, he writes to Thomas Jefferson, November 15, 1813:—

“Many hundred years must roll away before we shall be corrupted. *Our pure, virtuous, public-spirited, federative Republic will last forever, govern the globe, and introduce the perfection of man.*”²

Then, again, in a letter to Hezekiah Niles, 13th February, 1818:—

“The American Revolution was not a common event. Its effects and consequences have already been awful over a great part of the globe. *And when and where are they to cease?*”³

The prophetic spirit which filled the “visions” of youth continued in the “dreams” of age. Especially was he constant in foreseeing the widening reach of the great Revolution he had helped at its beginning; and this arrested the attention of his eloquent eulogist at Faneuil Hall.⁴

¹ Works, Vol. VI. p. 218.

² Writings of Jefferson, Vol. VI. p. 253.

³ Works, Vol. X. p. 282.

⁴ Webster, Discourse in Commemoration of the Lives and Services of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, delivered in Faneuil Hall, Boston, August 2, 1826: Works, Vol. I. p. 139.

MARQUIS DE MONTCALM, 1758, 1759.

IF I enter the name of the Marquis de Montcalm on this list, it is because prophetic words have been attributed to him which at different periods have attracted no small attention. He was born near Nismes, in France, 1712, and died at Quebec, 14th September, 1759, being at the time commander of the French forces in Canada. As a soldier he was the peer of his opponent, Wolfe, who perished in the same battle, and they have since enjoyed a common fame.

In 1777, amidst the heats of our Revolutionary contest, a publication was put forth by Almon, the pamphleteer, in French and English on opposite pages, entitled "Letters from the Marquis de Montcalm, Governor-General of Canada, to Messrs. De Berryer and De la Molé, in the Years 1757, 1758, and 1759," and the soldier reappeared as prophet.

The first letter is addressed to M. de Berryer, First Commissioner of the Marine of France, and purports to be dated at Montreal, 4th April, 1757. It contains the copy of an elaborate communication from "S. J." of Boston, proposing a scheme for undermining the power of Great Britain in the Colonies by free trade with France through Canada, and predicting that "all our colonies in less than ten years will catch fire."¹ In transmitting this letter Montcalm did little more than indorse its sentiments; but in his second letter to the same person, dated at Montreal, 1st October, 1758, he says:—

"All these informations, which I every day receive, confirm me in my opinion that *England will one day lose her colonies on the continent of America*; and if Canada should

¹ Page 8.

then be in the hands of an able governor who understands his business, he will have a thousand opportunities of hastening the event: this is the only advantage we can reap for all it has cost us." ¹

In the third letter, addressed to M. Molé, First President of the Parliament of Paris, and dated at the camp before Quebec, 24th August, 1759, on the eve of the fatal battle in which both commanders fell, Montcalm mounts the tripod:—

"They are in a condition to give us battle, which I must not refuse, and which I cannot hope to gain. . . . The event must decide. But of one thing be certain, that I probably shall not survive the loss of the Colony.² . . . I shall at least console myself on my defeat, and on the loss of the Colony, by the full persuasion that this defeat will one day serve my country more than a victory, and that the conqueror, in aggrandizing himself, will find his tomb the country he gains from us.³ . . . All the English Colonies would long since have shaken off the yoke, each province would have formed itself into a little independent republic, if the fear of seeing the French at their door had not been a check upon them.⁴ . . . Canada, once taken by the English, would in a few years suffer much from being forced to be English. . . . They would soon be of no use to England, and perhaps they would oppose her." ⁵

At once, on their appearance, these letters played an important part in the "high life" of politics. The "Monthly Review"⁶ called them "genuine." The "Gentleman's Magazine"⁷ said that "the sagacity of this accomplished general was equal to his bravery," and quoted what it characterized as a "remarkable predic-

¹ Page 18.

³ Page 22.

⁵ Page 27.

⁷ July, 1777.

² Page 21.

⁴ Page 24.

⁶ April, 1777.

tion." In the House of Lords, 30th May, 1777, during a debate begun by Lord Chatham, and flashing with great names, Lord Shelburne said that they "had been discovered to be a forgery";¹ but Lord Mansfield, the illustrious Chief Justice, relied upon the letters, "which he insisted were not spurious."² In another important debate, in the House of Lords, 5th March, 1778, Earl Temple observed that "the authenticity of those letters had been often disputed; but he could affirm that he saw them in manuscript, among the papers of a minister now deceased, long before they made their appearance in print, and at a time when American independency was in the contemplation of a very few persons indeed."³ Such was the contemporary testimony; but the pamphlet shared the fate of the numerous brood engendered by the war.

Oblivion seemed to have settled on these letters, when their republication at Gibraltar, as late as 1858, by an author who treated them as genuine,⁴ attracted the attention of Thomas Carlyle, who proceeded to make them famous again, by introducing them as an episode in his *Life of Frederick*, sometimes called "the Great." Montcalm appears once more as prophet, and the readers of the career of the Prussian monarch turn with wonder to the inspired Frenchman, with "his power of faithful observation, his sagacity and talent of prophecy, so considerable."⁵ Then, quoting a portion of the last letter, the great author exclaims at different points: "Prediction first"; "This is a curi-

¹ Hansard's Parliamentary History, Vol. XIX. col. 346.

² *Ibid.*, col. 351.

³ *Ibid.*, col. 347.

⁴ *The Plains of Abraham, Notes Original and Selected*, by Lieutenant-Colonel R. E. Beatson.

⁵ *History of Friedrich II. of Prussia*, (London, 1858-65,) Vol. V. p. 557.

ously exact prediction"; "Prediction second, which is still more curious."¹

If the letter quoted by Carlyle were genuine, as he accepted it, (also as it was evidently accepted by Lord John Russell,)² and as the family of Montcalm seem to believe, it would indicate for the soldier all that was claimed by his descendant, when, after speaking of his "political foresight," he added that it "was proved by one of his letters, in which he made a remarkable prophecy concerning the American Revolution."³ Certainly, — if the letter is not an invention; but such is the present impression. On the half-title of the original pamphlet, in the Library of Harvard University, Sparks, whose judgment is of great weight, has written: "The letters are unquestionably spurious." Others unite with him. It is impossible to read the papers in the "Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society," already quoted, and the pungent note of Henry Stevens, in his "Bibliotheca Historica," under the title of the much-debated pamphlet, without feeling, that, whatever may have been the merits of Montcalm as a soldier, his title as a prophet cannot be accepted. His name is introduced here that I may not omit an instance which has attracted attention in more than one generation.

DUC DE CHOISEUL, 1767, 1768.

ANOTHER Frenchman in this far-sighted list was the Comte de Stainville, afterwards Duc de Choiseul, born

¹ History of Friedrich II. of Prussia, Vol. V. p. 558.

² Speech in the House of Commons, February 8, 1850: Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3d Ser., Vol. CVIII. col. 537.

³ Remarks of Mr. Parkman: Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 1869-70, p. 113.

28th June, 1719, and died 8th May, 1785. His brilliant career as diplomatist and statesman was preceded by a career of arms with rapid promotion, so that at the age of forty he became lieutenant-general. Meanwhile he was ambassador at Rome and then at Vienna, the two pinnacles of diplomatic life. In 1758 he became Minister of Foreign Affairs, also duke and peer; then Minister of War, and of the Marine; but in 1766 he resumed the Foreign Office, which he held till 1770, when he was disgraced. The King could not pardon the contempt with which, although happy in the smiles of Madame de Pompadour, the Prime-Minister rejected the advances of her successor, the ignoble Du Barry; and he was exiled from court to live in his château of Chanteloup, in the valley of the Loire, where, dispensing a magnificent hospitality, he was consoled by a loving wife and devoted friends.

He had charm of manner rather than person, with a genius for statesmanship recognized and commemorated in contemporary writings. Madame du Deffant speaks of him often in her correspondence, and depicts him in her circle when Franklin was first presented there. Horace Walpole returns to him in letters and in his memoirs, attributing to him "great parts," calling him "very daring, dashing, and whose good-nature would not have checked his ambition from doing any splendid mischief."¹ The Abbé Barthélemy, in his "Travels of Anacharsis," portrays him under the character of Arsame. Frederick of Prussia, so often called the Great, hailed him "Coachman of Europe." And our own historian Bancroft, following Chatham, does

¹ Letter to the Countess of Ossory, November 8, 1789: Letters, ed. Cunningham, Vol. IX. p. 234.

not hesitate to call him "the greatest minister of France since Richelieu."

The two volumes of *Memoirs* purporting to be written by himself, and printed under his eyes in his cabinet in 1778, were accidental pieces, written, but never collected by him, nor intended as memoirs.¹ In the French treasure-house of these productions they are of little value, if not unworthy of his fame.

Besides a brilliant and famous administration of affairs, are several acts not to be forgotten. At Rome his skill was shown in bringing Benedict the Fourteenth to a common understanding on the bull *Unigenitus*. Through him in 1764 the Jesuits were suppressed in France, or were permitted only on condition of fusing with the secular clergy. But nothing in his career was more memorable than his foresight and courage with regard to the English Colonies. American Independence was foreseen and helped by him.

The *Memoirs* of Choiseul have little of the elevation recognized in his statesmanship, nor are they anywhere prophetic. Elsewhere his better genius was manifest, especially in his diplomacy. This was recognized by Talleyrand, who, in a paper on the "Advantages to be derived from New Colonies," read before the Institute toward the close of the last century, characterized him as "one of the men of our age who had the most forecast of mind, — *who already in 1769 foresaw the separation of America from England*, and feared the partition of Poland"; and he adds that "from this epoch he sought to prepare by negotiations the cession of Egypt to France,

¹ *Mémoires de M. le Duc de Choiseul, écrits par lui-même, et imprimés sous ses Yeux dans son Cabinet à Chanteloup en 1778. 2 Tom. Chanteloup et Paris, 1790.*

that on the day our American colonies should escape from us, he might be ready to replace them with the same productions and a more extended commerce.”¹

Bancroft, whose work shows unprecedented access to original documents, recognizes the prevision of the French minister at an earlier date, as attested by the archives of the French Foreign Office. In 1766 he received the report of a special agent who had visited America. In 1767 he sent Baron de Kalb, afterwards an officer in our Revolution, — sparing no means to obtain information, and drawing even from New England sermons, of which curious extracts are preserved among the State Papers of France.² In August of this year, writing to his plenipotentiary at London, the Minister says with regard to England and her Colonies: “Let her but attempt to establish taxes in them, and those countries, greater than England in extent, and perhaps becoming more populous, having fisheries, forests, shipping, corn, iron, and the like, will easily and fearlessly separate themselves from the mother country.”³ In the next year Du Châtelet, son of her who was the companion of Voltaire and the French translator of Newton, becomes his most sympathetic representative. To him the Minister wrote, 15th July, 1768: “According to the prognostications of sensible men, who have had opportunity to study the character of the Americans, and to measure their progress from day to day in the spirit of independence, this separation

¹ *Essai sur les Avantages à retirer de Colonies nouvelles dans les Circonstances présentes*, par le Citoyen Talleyrand, lu à la Séance publique de l'Institut National, le 25 Messidor, An V. See *Historical Characters*, by Sir Henry Lytton Bulwer, Vol. I. p. 461, Appendix.

² Bancroft, *History of the United States*, Vol. V. p. 193; VI. pp. 25, 67.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. VI. pp. 95, 96.

of the American Colonies from the metropolis sooner or later must come. . . . I see all these difficulties, and do not dissemble their extent; but I see also the controlling interest of the Americans to profit by the opportunity of a rupture to establish their independence."¹ Again he wrote, 22d November, 1768: "The Americans will not lose out of their view their rights and their privileges; and next to fanaticism for religion, the fanaticism for liberty is the most daring in its measures and the most dangerous in its consequences."² That the plenipotentiary was not less prompt in forecast appears in a letter of 9th November, 1768: "Without exaggerating the projects or the union of the Colonies, the time of their independence is very near. . . . Three years ago the separation of the English Colonies was looked upon as an object of attention for the next generation; the germs were observed, but no one could foresee that they would be so speedily developed. This new order of things, this event which will necessarily have the greatest influence on the whole political system of Europe, will probably be brought about within a very few years."³ The Minister replied, 20th December, 1768: "Your views are as subtle as they are comprehensive and well-considered. The King is perfectly aware of their sagacity and solidity, and I will communicate them to the Court of Madrid."⁴

These passages show a persistency of view, which became the foundation of French policy; so that the Duke was not merely a prophet, but a practical statesman, guided by remarkable foresight. He lived long enough to witness the National Independence he had

¹ Bancroft, *History of the United States*, Vol. VI. pp. 169, 170.

² *Ibid.*, p. 237.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 244, 245.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 245.

foretold, and to meet Franklin at Paris, while saved from witnessing the overthrow of the monarchy he had served, and the bloody harvest of the executioner, where a beloved sister was among the victims.

ABBÉ RAYNAL, 1770-1780.

GUILLAUME THOMAS FRANÇOIS RAYNAL, of France, was born 11th March, 1711, and died 6th March, 1796, thus spanning, with his long life, from the failing years of Louis the Fourteenth to the Reign of Terror, and embracing the prolonged period of intellectual activity which prepared the Revolution. Among contemporary "philosophers" his place was considerable. But he was a philosopher with a cross of the adventurer and charlatan.

Beginning as Jesuit and as priest, he somewhat tardily escaped the constraints of the latter to employ the education of the former in literary enterprise. A long list of acknowledged works attests the activity of his pen, while others were attributed to him. With these avocations, yielding money, mingled jobbing and speculation, where even the slave-trade, afterwards furiously condemned, became a minister of fortune. In the bright and audacious circles of Paris, especially with Diderot and D'Holbach, he found society. The remarkable fame which he reached during life has ceased, and his voluminous writings slumber in oblivion, except, perhaps, a single one, which for a while played a great part, and by its prophetic spirit vindicates a place in our American gallery.

Only the superficial character of this work appears in its title,—*"Philosophical and Political History of*

the Establishments and of the Commerce of the Europeans in the two Indies,"¹ being in six volumes. It was a frame for pictures and declamations, where freedom of thought was practically illustrated. Therefore it was published without the name of the author, and at Amsterdam. This was as early as 1770. Edition followed edition. The "Biographie Universelle" reports more than twenty regular and nearly fifty pirated. At least twelve editions of an English translation saw the light. It was translated, abridged, and reprinted in nearly all the languages of Europe. The subject was interesting at the time, but the peculiar treatment and the open assault upon existing order gave the work zest and popularity. Though often vicious in style, it was above the author in force and character, so that it was easy to believe that important parts were contributed by others. Diderot, who passed his life in helping others, is said to have supplied nearly a third of the whole. The work at last drew down untimely vengeance. Inspired by its signal success, the author, in 1780, after the lapse of a decade, put forth an enlarged edition, with frontispiece and portrait, the whole reinforced with insertions and additions, where Christianity and even the existence of a God were treated with the license already applied to other things. The Parliament of Paris, by a decree dated May 21, 1781, handed the work to the public executioner to be burned, and condemned the author in person and goods. Several years of exile followed.

The Revolution in France found the Abbé Raynal mellowed by time, and with his sustaining philosophers

¹ *Histoire Philosophique et Politique des Établissements et du Commerce des Européens dans les deux Indes.*

all dead. Declining active participation in the great conflict, he reappeared at last, so far as to address the President of the National Assembly a letter, where he pleaded for moderation and an active government. The ancient assailant of kings now called for "the tutelary protection of the royal authority." The early *cant* was exchanged for *recant*.

The concluding book of the enlarged edition of his famous work contains a chapter entitled "Reflections upon the Good and the Evil which the Discovery of America has done to Europe."¹ A question of similar import, "Has the Discovery of America been hurtful or useful to the Human Race?" he presented as the subject for a prize of twelve hundred livres, to be awarded by the Academy of Lyons. Such a question reveals a strange confusion, inconsistent with all our prophetic voices, but to be pardoned at a time when the course of civilization was so little understood, and Buffon had announced, as the conclusion of science, that the animal creation degenerated on the American Continent. In his admirable answer to the great naturalist, Jefferson repels with spirit the allegation of the Abbé Raynal that "America has not yet produced one good poet, one able mathematician, one man of genius in a single art or science."² But he does not seem aware that the author in his edition of 1780 had already beaten a retreat from his original position.³ This is more noteworthy as the edition appeared before the criticism.

It was after portraying the actual condition of the English Colonies in colors which aroused the protest

¹ Histoire Philosophique et Politique, (Genève, 1780,) Liv. XIX. ch. 15.

² Notes on Virginia, Query VI.: Writings, Vol. VIII. p. 312.

³ Liv. XVIII. ch. 32.

of Jefferson that the French philosopher surrendered to a vision of the future. In reply to doubts, he invokes time, civilization, education, and breaks forth:—

“Perhaps then it will be seen that America is favorable to genius, to the creative arts of peace and of society. A new Olympus, an Arcadia, an Athens, a new Greece, on the Continent, or in the archipelago which surrounds it, will give birth, perhaps, to Homers, Theocrituses, and, above all, Anacreons. Perhaps another Newton will rise in the new Britain. It is from English America, no doubt, that the first ray of the sciences will shoot forth, if they are to appear at last under a sky so long clouded. By a singular contrast with the ancient world, where the arts passed from the South toward the North, in the new we shall see the North enlighten the South. Let the English clear the land, purify the air, change the climate, meliorate Nature; *a new universe will issue from their hands for the glory and happiness of humanity.*”¹

Then, speculating on the dissensions prevailing between the Colonies and the mother country, he announces separation, but without advantage to the European rivals of England:—

“Break the knot which binds the ancient Britain to the new; soon the Northern Colonies will have more strength alone than they possessed in their union with the mother country. That great continent, set free from all compact with Europe, will be unhampered in all its movements. . . . The colonies of our absolute monarchies, . . . following the example of the English colonies, will break the chain which binds them shamefully to Europe.”²

¹ Histoire Philosophique et Politique, (Amsterdam, 1772,) Liv. XVIII. Tom. VI. p. 379.

² Ibid., pp. 426, 427.

The New World opens before the prophet :—

“So everything conspires to the great dismemberment, of which it is not given to foresee the moment. Everything tends to that, — both the progress of good in the new hemisphere, and the progress of evil in the old.

“Alas! the sudden and rapid decline of our morals and our strength, the crimes of kings and the woes of peoples, will render even universal that fatal catastrophe which is to detach one world from the other. The mine is prepared beneath the foundations of our rocking empires. . . . In proportion as our peoples are growing weak and all succumbing one to another, population and agriculture are increasing in America. The arts transported by our care will quickly spring up there. That country, risen from nothing, burns to figure in its turn upon the face of the globe and in the history of the world. O posterity! thou wilt be more happy, perhaps, than thy sad and contemptible ancestors!”¹

The edition of 1780 exhibits his sympathies with the Colonies. In considering the policy of the House of Bourbon, he recognizes the grasp of the pending revolution. “The United States,” he says, “have shown openly the project of drawing to their confederation *all North America*”; and he mentions especially *the invitation to the people of Canada*. While questioning the conduct of France and Spain, he adds:—

“The new hemisphere is to detach itself some day from the old. This great disruption is prepared in Europe by the fermentation and the clashing of our opinions, — by the overthrow of our rights, which made our courage, — by the

¹ *Histoire Philosophique et Politique*, (Amsterdam, 1772,) Liv. XVIII. Tom. VI. pp. 427, 428.

luxury of the court and the misery of the country,—by the everlasting hate between the effeminate men, who possess all, and the strong, even virtuous men, who have nothing to lose but life. It is prepared in America by the growth of population, of agriculture, of industry, and of enlightenment. *Everything tends to this scission.*"¹

In a sketch which follows are pictured the resources of "the thirteen confederate provinces" and their future development. While confessing that the name of Liberty is sweet,—that it is the cause of the entire human race,—that revolutions in its name are a lesson to despots,—that the spirit of justice, which compensates past evils by future happiness, is pleased to believe that this part of the New World cannot fail to become one of the most flourishing countries of the globe,—and that some go so far as to fear *that Europe may some day find its masters in its children*, he proceeds to facts which may mitigate anxiety.²

The prophetic words of Raynal differ from others already quoted. Instead of letters or papers buried in secrecy or disclosed to a few only, they were open proclamations circulated throughout Europe, and their influence began as early as 1770. A prompt translation made them known in England. In 1777 they were quoted by an English writer pleading for us.³ Among influences coöperating with the justice of our cause, they were of constant activity, until at last France, Spain, and Holland openly united with us.

¹ *Histoire Philosophique et Politique*, (Genève, 1780,) Liv. XVIII. ch. 51, Tom. IX. pp. 369, 370.

² *Ibid.*, Liv. XVIII. ch. 52, pp. 373, seqq.

³ Dr. Price, in his second tract, "Additional Observations on the Nature and Value of Civil Liberty and the War with America," (London, 1777,) pp. 87, 88, note.

JONATHAN SHIPLEY, BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH, 1773.

NOT without heartfelt emotion do I write this name, never to be mentioned by an American without a sentiment of gratitude and love. Such goodness and ability, dedicated so firmly to our cause, make Shipley conspicuous among his contemporaries. In beauty of character and in prophetic spirit he resembles Berkeley. And yet biographical dictionaries make little mention of him, and in our country he is known chiefly through the friendship of Franklin. He was born about 1714, and died 9th December, 1788.

His actual preferments in the Church attest a certain success, arrested at last by his sympathy for us. At an early day John Adams spoke of him as "the best bishop that adorns the bench."¹ And we learn from Wraxall, that it was through the hostility of the King, that, during the short-lived Coalition Ministry, Fox was prevented from making him Archbishop of Canterbury.² But his public life was better than any prelacy. It is impossible to read his writings without discovering the stamp of superiority, where accuracy and clearness go hand in hand with courage and truth.

The relations of Franklin with the good Bishop are a beautiful episode in our Revolutionary history. Two men, one English and the other American, venerable with years, mingled in friendship warm as that of youth, but steady to the grave, joining identity of sentiment on important public questions with personal affection. While Franklin remained in England, as Colonial repre-

¹ *Novanglus*, or a History of the Dispute with America, written in 1774: Works, Vol. IV. p. 37.

² *Historical Memoirs of his own Time*, (London, 1836,) Vol. III. p. 347.

sentative, watching the currents, he was a frequent guest at the Englishman's country home; and there he entered upon his incomparable autobiography, leaving behind such pleasant memories that afterwards the family never walked in the garden "without seeing Dr. Franklin's room and thinking of the work that was begun in it."¹ One of the daughters, in a touching letter to him, then at his own home in Philadelphia, informed him of her father's death,² and in reply to his "dear young friend," he expressed his sense of the loss, "not to his family and friends only, but to his nation, and to the world," and then, after mentioning that he was in his eighty-fourth year and considerably enfeebled, added, "You will, then, my dear friend, consider this as probably the last line to be received from me, and as a taking leave."³

This brief story prepares the way for the two productions illustrating his service to us. The first has the following title: "A Sermon preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, at their Anniversary Meeting in the Parish Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, on Friday, February 19, 1773." Of this discourse several editions appeared in London, New York, and Boston.⁴ Lord Chatham, after confessing himself "charmed and edified" by it, wrote: "This noble discourse speaks the preacher not only fit

¹ Letter of Miss Catherine Louisa Shipley, August 2, 1785: Franklin's Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. X. p. 220.

² Letter of Same, December 24, 1788: *Ibid.*, pp. 379, 380.

³ Letter to Same, April 27, 1789: *Ibid.*, p. 391.

⁴ One of London and another of New York are in the Congressional Library. The New York copy has the pencil lines of Mr. Webster, marking what he calls "remarkable passages," used by him in his "Address at the Laying of the Corner-Stone of the Addition to the Capitol, 4th July, 1851": Works, Vol. II. p. 597.

to bear rule in the Church, but in the State ; indeed, it does honor to the Right Reverend Bench.”¹ Franklin, coupling it with another of his productions relating to America, wrote : “ Had his counsels in those pieces been attended to by the Ministers, how much bloodshed might have been prevented, and how much expense and disgrace to the nation avoided ! ”²

This discourse was from the text, “ Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men.”³ After announcing that “ perhaps the annals of history have never afforded a more grateful spectacle to a benevolent and philosophic mind than the growth and progress of the British Colonies in North America,” the preacher becomes prophet, and here his words are memorable : —

“ The Colonies in North America have not only taken root and acquired strength, but seem hastening with an accelerated progress to such a powerful state *as may introduce a new and important change in human affairs.* ”⁴

Then picturing the Colonies as receiving “ by inheritance all the improvements and discoveries of their mother country,” — commencing “ their flourishing state at a time when the human understanding has attained to the free use of its powers, and has learned to act with vigor and certainty,” and being in such a situation that “ they may avail themselves not only of the experience and industry, but even of the errors and mistakes of former days,” the prophet proceeds : —

¹ Letter to the Earl of Shelburne, October 24, 1773 : Correspondence, Vol. IV. p. 302.

² Letter to Miss C. L. Shipley, April 27, 1789 : Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. X. p. 391.

³ Luke, ii. 14.

⁴ Sermon, (Boston, 1773,) p. 5.

"The vast continent itself, over which they are gradually spreading, may be considered as a treasure yet untouched of natural productions *that shall hereafter afford ample matter for commerce and contemplation.* And if we reflect what a stock of knowledge may be accumulated by the constant progress of industry and observation, . . . *it is difficult even to imagine to what height of improvement their discoveries may extend.*"¹

The prophet opens another vista: "And perhaps they may make as considerable *advances in the arts of civil government* and the conduct of life." Then, exhibiting the excellences of the British Constitution with its "equal representation," which he calls "the best discovery of political wisdom," and inquiring anxiously if they "must rest here, as in the utmost effort of human genius," the preacher becomes again prophetic:—

"May they not possibly be more successful than their mother country has been in preserving that reverence and authority which is due to the laws,—to those who make, and to those who execute them? May not a method be invented of procuring some tolerable share of the comforts of life to those inferior useful ranks of men to whose industry we are indebted for the whole? *Time and discipline may discover some means to correct the extreme inequalities of condition between the rich and the poor, so dangerous to the innocence and the happiness of both.*"²

Beautiful words! And in the same spirit the prophet discerns increasing opportunities of progress:—

"The diversity of new scenes and situations, which so many growing states must necessarily pass through, *may introduce changes in the fluctuating opinions and manners of men which we can form no conception of.* And not only the

¹ Sermon, pp. 7, 8.

² Ibid., pp. 8, 9.

gracious disposition of Providence, but the visible preparation of causes, *seems to indicate strong tendencies towards a general improvement.*"¹

To a spirit so elevated the obligations of duty are the same for nations as for individuals, and he nobly vindicates the duty of the Christian preacher "to point out the laws of justice and equity which must ultimately regulate the happiness of states as well as of individuals," and which he declares "are no other than those benevolent Christian morals which it is the province of this Society to teach, transferred from the duties of private life to the administration of public affairs."² Then again he declares amazement, in which all but hardened politicians will unite, at seeing "how slowly in all countries the principles of natural justice, which are so evidently necessary in private life, have been admitted into the administration of public affairs." And, in the same spirit, he announces:—

"A time, I doubt not, will come, in the progressive improvement of human affairs, when the checks and restraints we lay on the industry of our fellow-subjects and the jealousies we conceive at their prosperity will be considered as the effects of a mistaken policy, prejudicial to all parties, but chiefly to ourselves."³

Then, after presenting it as "a noble effort of virtuous ambition . . . to make our country great and powerful and rich, not by force or fraud, but by justice, friendship, and humanity," this remarkable sermon concludes with calling attention to "the plain good rules so often repeated to us in Scripture," which "lie before the eyes of men like medicinal herbs in the open field."⁴

¹ Sermon, p. 9. ² Ibid., p. 14. ³ Ibid., pp. 15, 16. ⁴ Ibid., p. 16.

In the course of his remarks, the preacher lets drop words often quoted since, and doubtless considered much in conversation with Franklin. After setting forth that the Colonies had "been trusted in a good measure with the entire management of their affairs," he proceeds to say: "And the success they have met with ought to be to us an ever-memorable proof that *the true art of government consists in not governing too much.*"¹

In similar spirit the good Bishop came to the defence of Massachusetts, in the crisis which followed the nullification of the Tea-Tax, — as witness an able pamphlet, printed in 1774, entitled "A Speech intended to have been spoken on the Bill for altering the Charters of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay." In this most vigorous production, reported by Franklin as "a masterpiece of eloquence,"² where he pleads for reconciliation, after announcing that England had drawn from the Colonies, by commerce, "more clear profit than Spain has drawn from all its mines,"³ he says: "Let them continue to enjoy the liberty our fathers gave them. Gave them, did I say? They are coheirs of liberty with ourselves; and their portion of the inheritance has been much better looked after than ours."⁴ Then again: "My Lords, I look upon North America as the only great nursery of freemen now left upon the face of the earth."⁵ And yet once more: "But whatever may be our future fate, the greatest glory that attends this country, a greater than any other nation ever acquired, is to have formed and nursed

¹ Sermon, p. 11.

² Letter to Mr. Coombe, July 22, 1774: Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. VIII. p. 124.

³ Speech, (London, 1774,) p. 15.

⁴ Ibid., p. 27.

⁵ Ibid., p. 31.

up to such a state of happiness those Colonies whom we are now so eager to butcher.”¹ Thanks, perpetual thanks, to the good friend who stood so well by our country in its beginning, and discerned so clearly its exalted future!

DEAN TUCKER, 1774.

IN contrast with Shipley was his contemporary, Josiah Tucker, also of the Church, who was born 1712, and died 4th November, 1799.

The contrast is more curious, when it is considered that Tucker, like Shipley, was for the peaceful separation of the Colonies from the mother country; but the former was biting and cynical, while the latter was sympathetic and kind. The former sent forth a succession of criticisms as from the tub of Diogenes, while the latter, with genial power, vindicated America and predicted its future. The former was a carping censor and enemy of Franklin; the latter, his loving friend.

Tucker was rector of a church in Bristol and Dean of Gloucester, and he announces that he had “written near three hundred sermons, and preached them all again and again”;² but it was by political essays that he made his name known and became a conspicuous gladiator.

Here it is easy to recognize industry, facility, boldness. He was not afraid to speak out, nor did he shrink from coping with those who commanded the public attention, — joining issue directly with Burke, “in answer to his printed speech, *said to be spoken* in the House of

¹ Speech, pp. 32, 33.

² Chalmers, Biographical Dictionary, art. TUCKER.

Commons on the 22d of March, 1775,"¹ being that famous masterpiece, on "Conciliation with America," so much read, so often quoted, and so highly placed among the efforts of human genius. The Dean used plain language, charging the great orator with excelling "in the art of ambiguous expressions," and at all times having one general end in view, "to amuse with tropes and figures and great swelling words," and hoping, that, while emulating the freedom of Burke in examining the writings and opinions of others, he should do it "with more decency and good manners."² More than once the Dean complains that the orator had classed him by name with what he called "court vermin."³

As early as 1766, in the heats of the Stamp Act, he entered the lists by an unamiable pamphlet, entitled "A Letter from a Merchant in London to his Nephew in North America, relative to the Present Posture of Affairs in the Colonies." Here appears the vigorous cynicism of his nature. The mother country is vindicated, and the Colonies are told that "the complaint of being unrepresented is entirely false and groundless," inasmuch as every member of Parliament, when once chosen, becomes "the equal guardian of all," and "*our* Birminghams, Manchesters, Leeds, Halifaxes, &c., and *your* Bostons, New Yorks, and Philadelphias are all as *really*, though not so nominally, represented as any part whatsoever of the British Empire."⁴ In the same spirit

¹ Tucker's Letter to Burke, (Glocester, 1775, 2d edit.,) title-page.

² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³ See Letter to Burke, 1775. 2d edit.. p. 5; Humble Address, 1775, 2d edit., p. 8; and Series of Answers to Popular Objections, 1776, pp. xii, 97. For the matter thus repeatedly and long complained of, see Burke's Speech on American Taxation, April 19, 1774: Works, (Boston, 1865-67,) Vol. II. pp. 56, 57..

⁴ Letter from a Merchant in London, (London, 1766,) pp. 19, 20.

he ridiculed the pretensions of the Colonists, putting into their mouths the words: "What! an Island! a spot such as this to command the great and mighty Continent of North America! Preposterous! A Continent, whose inhabitants double every five-and-twenty years! who, therefore, within a century and an half will be upwards of an hundred and twenty millions of souls! Forbid it, Patriotism, forbid it, Politics, that such a great and mighty Empire as this should be held in subjection by the paltry Kingdom of Great Britain! *Rather let the seat of empire be transferred; and let it be fixed where it ought to be, namely, in Great America!*"¹ And then declaring "the calculations themselves both false and absurd," taunting the Colonists with inability to make the mother country "a province of America," and depicting the evils that will ensue to them from separation, he announces, that, "having been surfeited with the bitter fruits of American Republicanism, they will heartily wish and petition to be again united to the mother country."²

As the conflict approached, the Dean became more earnest and incessant. In 1774 he published a book entitled "Four Tracts on Political and Commercial Subjects," of which the third was a reprint of the "Letter from a Merchant in London," and the fourth was a new appeal, entitled "The True Interest of Great Britain set forth in regard to the Colonies, and the only Means of Living in Peace and Harmony with them,"—"including Five different Plans for effecting this Desirable Event."³ Here he openly proposed separation,

¹ Letter from a Merchant in London, p. 42.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 43, 54.

³ The Fourth Tract was published separately in Philadelphia, in 1776, with this addition to the title.

and predicted its advantage to England. On general grounds he was persuaded that extensive colonies were an evil rather than an advantage, especially to a commercial nation, while he was satisfied of a present alienation on the part of America, which it would be unprofitable, if not perilous, to combat. England was in no mood for such truth, and the author was set down as madman or quack. Evidently he was a prophet.

A few passages will show the character of this remarkable production.

"It is the nature of them all [colonies] to aspire after independence, and to set up for themselves as soon as ever they find that they are able to subsist without being beholden to the mother country."¹

True enough, and often said by others. In dealing with the different plans the Dean shows originality. To the idea of compulsion by arms he exclaimed: "But, alas! victory alone is but a poor compensation for all the blood and treasure which must be spilt."² The scheme numbered Fourth was nothing less than "to consent that America should become the general seat of empire, and that Great Britain and Ireland should be governed by viceroys sent over from the court residences either at Philadelphia or New York, or at some other American imperial city," — to which the indefatigable Dean replies: —

"Now, wild as such a scheme may appear, there are certainly some Americans who seriously embrace it; and the late prodigious swarms of emigrants encourage them to suppose that a time is approaching when the seat of empire

¹ True Interest of Great Britain: Four Tracts, (3d edit., Gloucester, 1776,) pp. 161, 162.

² Ibid., pp. 196, 197.

must be changed. But, whatever events may be in the womb of Time, or whatever revolutions may happen in the rise and fall of empires, there is not the least probability that this country should ever become a province to North America: . . . unless, indeed, we should add one extravagance to another, by supposing that these American heroes are to conquer all the world; and in that case I do allow that England must become a province to America.”¹

Then comes the Fifth Scheme, which was, “To propose to separate entirely from the North American Colonies, by declaring them to be a free and independent people, over whom we lay no claim, and then by offering to guaranty this freedom and independence against all foreign invaders whatever.”² And he proceeds to show that by such separation the mother country would not lose the trade of the Colonies. His unamiable nature flares out in the suggestions, that, “the moment a separation takes effect, intestine quarrels will begin,” and that, “in proportion as their factious republican spirit shall intrigue and cabal, shall split into parties, divide and subdivide, in the same proportion shall we be called in to become their general umpires and referees,”³ while his confidence in the result is declared: “And yet I have observed, and have myself had some experience, that measures evidently right will prevail at last”; therefore he had “not the least doubt” but that a separation would take place “within half a century.”⁴ Though seeing the separation so clearly, he did not see how near at hand it then was.

The Dean grew more earnest. Other pamphlets followed: for instance, in 1775, “An Humble Address

¹ *True Interest of Great Britain: Four Tracts*, (3d edit.,) pp. 201, 202.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 202, 203.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 218, 219.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 221.

and Earnest Appeal, . . . whether a Connection with or a Separation from the Continental Colonies of America be most for the National Advantage and the Lasting Benefit of these Kingdoms." Here he says openly:—

"My scheme, which Mr. Burke, in his last speech, of March 22, 1775, is pleased to term a *childish* one, is, To separate totally from the Colonies, and to reject them from being fellow-members and joint partakers with us in the privileges and advantages of the British Empire, because they refuse to submit to the authority and jurisdiction of the British legislature, — offering at the same time to enter into alliances of friendship and treaties of commerce with them, as with any other sovereign, independent state."¹

Then, insisting that his scheme "most infallibly cuts off all the present causes of dispute and contention between the two countries, so that they never can revive again,"² he establishes that commercial intercourse with the Americans would not cease, inasmuch as it cannot be shown that they "will no longer adhere to their own interest when they shall be disunited from us."³

Among subsequent tracts was one entitled "*Cui Bono?* or, An Inquiry, What Benefits can arise either to the English or the Americans, the French, Spaniards, or Dutch, from the Greatest Victories or Successes in the Present War? Being a Series of Letters addressed to Monsieur Necker, late Controller-General of the Finances of France. London, 1782." Here was the same ardor for separation, with the same bitter words for the Colonies.

Tardily the foresight of the Dean was recognized, until at last Archbishop Whately, in his annotations upon Bacon's Essay on Honor and Reputation, com-

¹ Humble Address, (2d edit.,) p. 5. ² Ibid., p. 29. ³ Ibid., p. 47.

memorates it as an historic example. According to him, "the whole British nation were in one particular manifestly *puzzle-headed*, except *one* man, who was accordingly derided by all." Then mentioning the dispute between the mother country and her colonies, he says: "But Dean Tucker, standing quite alone, wrote a pamphlet to show that the separation would be no loss at all, and that we had best give them the independence they coveted at once and in a friendly way. Some thought he was writing in jest; the rest despised him, as too absurd to be worth answering. But now, and for above half a century, every one admits that he was quite right, and regrets that his view was not adopted."¹ Unquestionably this is a remarkable tribute. Kindred to it was that of the excellent Professor Smyth, who, in exhibiting the "American War," dwells on "the superior and the memorable wisdom of Tucker."²

The bad temper shooting from his writings interfered, doubtless, with their acceptance. His spirit, so hostile to us, justified his own characterization of himself as "the author of these tracts against the rebel Americans." As the war drew to a close, his bad temper still prevailed, heightened by antipathy to republicanism, so that, after picturing the Colonies, separated at last from the mother country, as having "gained a general disappointment mixed with anger and indignation,"³ he thus predicts their terrible destiny:—

"As to the future grandeur of America, and its being a rising empire under one head, whether republican or mon-

¹ Bacon's Essays, ed. Whately, (London, 1858,) pp. 548, 549.

² Lectures on Modern History, ed. Sparks, (Cambridge, 1841,) Lecture XXXIII., Vol. II. p. 377.

³ *Cui Bono* † (3d edit.,) p. 96.

archical, it is one of the idlest and most visionary notions that ever was conceived, even by writers of romance. For there is nothing in the genius of the people, the situation of their country, or the nature of their different climates, which tends to countenance such a supposition. . . . Above all, when those immense inland regions beyond the back settlements, which are still unexplored, are taken into the account, they form the highest probability that the Americans never can be united into one compact empire, under any species of government whatever. Their fate seems to be — *a disunited people till the end of time.*"¹

Alas! But evidently the Dean saw the future of our continent no better than the Ministry saw their duty with regard to it.

Unlike in spirit was Matthew Robinson, a contemporary friend of America, whose able and elaborate tracts² in successive editions are now forgotten, except so far as revived by the notice of Professor Smyth.³ His vindication of the Colonies, at the time of the Boston Port Bill, was complete, without the harshness of Tucker, and he did not hesitate to present the impossibility of conquering them. "What expectation or probability," he asks, "can there be of sending from hence armies capable to conquer and subdue so great a force of men defending and defended by such a continent?"⁴ Then, while depicting English mastery of the sea, he says: "We may do whatever a fleet can. Very true;

¹ Cui Bono? (3d edit.,) pp. 117 - 119.

² Considerations on the Measures carrying on with respect to the British Colonies in North America (1774). A Further Examination of our Present American Measures, and of the Reasons and the Principles on which they are founded (1776). Peace the Best Policy (1777).

³ Lectures on Modern History, ed. Sparks, Lecture XXXII., Vol. II. pp. 380 - 383.

⁴ Considerations, (2d edit.,) p. 66.

but it cannot sail all over North America.”¹ The productions of this enlightened author cannot have been without effect. Doubtless they helped the final acknowledgment of independence. When will the “Old Mortality” appear, to discover and restore his monument?

The able annotator of Lord Bacon was too sweeping, when he said that on the great American question all England was wrong, “except *one* man.” Robinson was as right as the Dean, and there were others also. The “Monthly Review,” in an article on the Dean’s appeal for separation, said: “This, however, is not a new idea. It has frequently occurred to others.”² Even Soame Jenyns, a life-long member of Parliament, essayist, poet, defender of Christianity, while upholding the right to tax the Colonies, is said to have accepted the idea of “total separation”:—

“Let all who view th’ instructive scene,
And patronize the plan,
Give thanks to Gloucester’s honest Dean,
For, Tucker, thou ’rt the man.”³

In a better spirit, and with affecting earnestness, John Cartwright, once of the Royal Navy, and known as Major from his rank in the Nottinghamshire Militia, followed the Dean, in 1774, with a series of letters collected in a pamphlet entitled “American Independence the Interest and Glory of Great Britain,” where he insists upon separation, and thenceforward a friendly league, “that the true and lasting welfare of both coun-

¹ Considerations, (2d edit.,) p. 72.

² February, 1774, Vol. L. p. 135.

³ The American Coachman: Works, Vol. I. p. 205. The editor, not regarding this little poem as a jest, says of it: “The author, with that conciseness as to the matter and humor in the manner so peculiar to himself, recommends and supports the Dean’s plan.”

tries can be promoted.”¹ In enforcing his conclusion the author says: “When we talk of asserting our sovereignty over the Americans, do we foresee to what fatal lengths it will carry us? Are not those nations increasing with astonishing rapidity? *Must they not, in the nature of things, cover in a few ages that immense continent like a swarm of bees?*”² Then again: “We may, indeed, by means of fleets and armies, maintain a precarious tyranny over the Americans for a while; but the most shallow politicians must foresee what this would end in.”³ Then, in reply to the Dean: “’Tis a pity so able a writer had not discovered that the Americans have a right to choose their own governors, and thence enforced the necessity of his proposed separation as a religious duty, no less than a measure of national policy.”⁴ Cartwright continued at home the conflicts of principle involved in our War of Independence, and became an English Reformer. Honor to his name!

•

DAVID HARTLEY, 1775, 1776, 1777, 1785.

ANOTHER English friend was David Hartley. He was constant and even pertinacious on our side, although less prophetic than Pownall, with whom he coöperated in purpose and activity. His father was Hartley the metaphysician, and author of the ingenious theory of sensation, who predicted the fate of existing governments and hierarchies in two simple sentences: “It is probable that all the present Civil Governments will

¹ American Independence, (Philadelphia, 1776,) title-page.

² Ibid., Letter VI., March 27, 1774, p. 65.

³ Ibid., p. 66.

⁴ Ibid., p. 68.

be overturned"; "It is probable that the present forms of Church Government will be dissolved."¹ Many were alarmed. Lady Charlotte Wentworth asked the prophet when these terrible things would happen. The answer was: "I am an old man, and shall not live to see them; but you are a young woman, and probably will see them."²

The son was born in 1729, and died at Bath in 1813. During our Revolution he sat in Parliament for Kingston-upon-Hull. He was also the British plenipotentiary in negotiating the Definitive Treaty of Peace with the United States. He has dropped out of sight. The biographical dictionaries afford him a few lines only. But he deserves a considerable place in the history of our Independence.

John Adams was often austere, and sometimes cynical, in his judgments. Evidently he did not like Hartley. In one place he speaks of him as "a person of consummate vanity";³ then, as "talkative and disputatious, and not always intelligible";⁴ and in still another place remarks, "Mr. Hartley was as copious as usual;"⁵ and when appointed to sign the Definitive Treaty, "It would have been more agreeable to have finished with Mr. Oswald."⁶ And yet, when writing most elaborately to the Comte de Vergennes on the state of affairs previous to the final campaign, he introduces opinions of Hartley at length, saying that he

¹ Observations on Man, Part II., Propositions 81, 82.

² Disraeli's Curiosities of Literature, (Boston, 1859,) Vol. IV. p. 174 : *Prediction*.

³ Diary, April 19, 1778 : Works, Vol. III. p. 137.

⁴ Letter to Arthur Lee, April 12, 1783 : Ibid., Vol. IX. p. 517.

⁵ Diary, April 27, 1783 : Ibid., Vol. III. p. 363.

⁶ Letter to Secretary Livingston, April 14, 1783 : Ibid., Vol. VIII. p. 54.

was "more for peace than any man in the kingdom."¹ Such testimony may well outweigh the other expressions, especially as nothing of the kind appears in the correspondence of Franklin, with whom Hartley was much more intimate.

The "Parliamentary History" is a sufficient monument for Hartley. He was a frequent speaker, and never missed an opportunity of pleading our cause. Although without the immortal eloquence of Burke, he was always clear and full. Many of his speeches seem written out by himself. He was not a tardy convert, but began as "a new member" by supporting an amendment favorable to the Colonies, 5th December, 1774. Then, in March, 1775, he brought forward "Propositions for Conciliation with America," which he sustained in an elaborate speech, where he avowed that the American question had occupied him for some time:—

"Though I have so lately had the honor of a seat in this House, yet I have for many years turned my thoughts and attention to matters of public concern and national policy. This question of America is now of many years' standing."²

In this speech he acknowledges the services of New England at Louisburg:—

"In that war too, Sir, they took Louisburg from the French, single-handed, without any European assistance: as mettled an enterprise as any in our history; an everlasting memorial of the zeal, courage, and perseverance of the troops of New England. The men themselves dragged the cannon over a morass which had always been thought im-

¹ Letter, July 13, 1780: *Ibid.*, Vol. VII. p. 226.

² Speech, March 27, 1775: *Hansard's Parliamentary History*, Vol. XVIII. col. 553.

passable, where neither horses nor oxen could go ; and they carried the shot upon their backs. And what was their reward for this forward and spirited enterprise,—for the reduction of this American Dunkirk ? Their reward, Sir, you know very well : it was given up for a barrier to the Dutch.”¹

All his various propositions were negatived ; but he was not disheartened. Constantly he spoke,—now on the Budget, then on the Address, and then on specific propositions. At this time he asserted the power of Parliament over the Colonies, and he proposed, on the 2d November, 1775, that a test of submission by the Colonists should be the recognition of an Act of Parliament enacting “that all the slaves in America should have the trial by jury.”² Shortly afterwards, on the 7th December, 1775, he brought forward a second set of “Propositions for Conciliation with America,” where, among other things, he embodied the test on slavery, which he put forward as a compromise ; and here his language belongs not only to the history of our Revolution, but to the history of Antislavery. While declaring that in his opinion Great Britain was “the aggressor in everything,”³ he sought to bring the two countries together on a platform of human rights, which he thus explained :—

“The act to be proposed to America, *as an auspicious beginning to lay the first stone of universal liberty to mankind*, should be what no American could hesitate an instant to comply with, namely, that every slave in North America should be entitled to his trial by jury in all criminal cases. America cannot refuse to accept and to enroll such an act as this, and thereby to reëstablish peace and harmony with

¹ Hansard's Parliamentary History, Vol. XVIII. col. 556.

² *Ibid.*, col. 846.

³ *Ibid.*, col. 1050.

the parent state. *Let us all be reunited in this, as a foundation to extirpate slavery from the face of the earth. Let those who seek justice and liberty for themselves give that justice and liberty to their fellow-creatures.* With respect to the idea of putting a final period to slavery in North America, it should seem best that when this country had led the way by the act for jury, that each Colony, knowing their own peculiar circumstances, should undertake the work in the most practicable way, and that they should endeavor to establish some system by which slavery should be in a certain term of years abolished. *Let the only contention henceforward between Great Britain and America be, which shall exceed the other in zeal for establishing the fundamental rights of liberty to all mankind."*¹

How grand and beautiful!—not to be read without gratitude! The motion was rejected; but among the twenty-three in its favor were Fox and Burke.

During this same month the unwearied defender of our country came forward again, declaring that he could not be "an adviser or a well-wisher to any of the vindictive operations against America, because he thought the cause unjust; but at the same time he must be equally earnest to secure British interests from destruction"; and he thus prophesies:—

"The fate of America is cast. You may bruise its heel, but you cannot crush its head. It will revive again. *The New World is before them. Liberty is theirs.* They have possession of a free government, their birthright and inheritance, derived to them from their parent state, which the hand of violence cannot wrest from them. If you will cast them off, my last wish is to them, May they go and prosper!"²

¹ Hansard's Parliamentary History, Vol. XVIII. col. 1049.

² Speech on the American Prohibitory Bill, December 21, 1775: Ibid., col. 1104, 1105.

Again, on the 10th May, 1776, he vindicated anew his original proposition; and here again he testifies for peace and against slavery:—

“For the sake of peace, therefore, I did propose a test of compromise, by an acceptance, on the part of the Colonists, of an Act of Parliament which should lay *the foundation for the extirpation of the horrid custom of slavery in the New World*. . . . My motion was . . . simply as an act of compromise and reconciliation; and, as far as it was a legislative act, it was still to have been applied in correcting the laws of slavery in America, which I considered as repugnant to the laws of the realm of England, and to the fundamentals of our Constitution. Such a compromise would at the same time have saved the national honor.”¹

All gratitude to the hero who at this early day vowed himself to the abolition of slavery! Hartley is among the first of Abolitionists, with hardly a predecessor except Granville Sharp, and in Parliament absolutely the first. Clarkson was at this time fifteen years old, Wilberforce sixteen. Only in 1785 Clarkson obtained the prize for the best Latin essay on the question, “Is it right to make men slaves against their will?”² It was not until 1791 that Wilberforce moved for leave to bring in a bill for the abolition of the slave-trade. It is no small honor for one man to have come forward in Parliament as an avowed abolitionist, while at the same time a vindicator of our independence.

Again, on the 15th May, 1777, Hartley pleaded for us:—

“At sea, which has hitherto been our prerogative element, they rise against us at a stupendous rate; and if we cannot

¹ Hansard's Parliamentary History, Vol. XVIII. col. 1356.

² Clarkson's History of the Abolition of the African Slave-Trade, (Philadelphia, 1808,) Vol. I. pp. 167, 170.

return to our old mutual hospitalities towards each other, a very few years will show us a most formidable hostile marine, ready to join hands with any of our enemies. . . . I will venture to prophesy that the principles of a federal alliance are the only terms of peace that ever will and that ever ought to obtain between the two countries.”¹

On the 5th of June, three weeks afterwards, the “Parliamentary History” reports briefly:—

“Mr. Hartley went upon the cruelties of slavery, and urged the Board of Trade to take some means of mitigating it. He produced a pair of handcuffs, which he said was a manufacture they were now going to establish.”²

Thus again the abolitionist reappeared in the vindicator of our independence. On the 22d June, 1779, he brought forward another formal motion “for reconciliation with America,” and, in the course of a well-considered speech, denounced the ministers for “headstrong and inflexible obstinacy in prosecuting a cruel and destructive American war.”³ On the 3d December, 1779, in what is called “a very long speech,” he returned to his theme, inveighing against ministers for “the favorite, though wild, Quixote, and impracticable measure of coercing America.”⁴ These are only instances.

During this time he maintained relations with Franklin, as appears in the “Diplomatic Correspondence of the Revolution,” all of which attests a desire for peace. In 1778 he arrived at Paris on a confidential errand, especially to confer with Franklin. On this occasion

¹ Hansard's Parliamentary History, Vol. XIX. col. 258-260.

² Ibid., Vol. XIX. col. 315.

³ Ibid., Vol. XX. col. 904.

⁴ Ibid., Vol. XX. col. 1190.

John Adams met him and judged him severely. In 1783 he was appointed a commissioner to sign the Definitive Treaty of Peace.

These things belong to history. Though perhaps not generally known, they are accessible. I have presented them for their intrinsic value and prophetic character, but also as the introduction to an unpublished letter from Hartley, which I received some time ago from an English friend, who has since been called away from important labors. The letter concerns *emigration to our country, and the payment of the national debt*. The following indorsement explains its character:—

“NOTE. This is a copy of the material portion of a long letter from D. Hartley, the British Commissioner in Paris, to Lord Sydenham, January, 1785. The original was sold by C. Robinson, of 21 Bond Street, London, on the 6th April, 1859, at a sale of Hartley’s MSS. and papers, chiefly relating to the United States of America. It was Hartley’s copy, in his own hand.

“The lot was No. 82 in the sale catalogue. It was bought by J. R. Smith, the London bookseller, for £2 6s. 0d.

“I had a copy made before the sale.

“JOSEPH PARKES.

“LONDON, 18 July, ’59.”

The letter is as follows:—

“MY LORD,—In your Lordship’s last letter to me, just before my leaving Paris, you are pleased to say that any information which I might have been able to collect of a nature to promote the mutual and reciprocal interests of Great Britain and the United States of America would be extremely acceptable to his Majesty’s government. . . . Annexed to this letter I have the honor of transmitting to

your Lordship some papers and documents which I have received from the American ministers. One of them (No. 5) is a Map of the Continent of North America, in which the land ceded to them by the late treaty of peace is divided by parallels of latitude and longitude into fourteen new States.

“The whole project, in its full extent, would take many years in its execution, and therefore it must be far beyond the present race of men to say, ‘This shall be so.’ Nevertheless, *those who have the first care of this New World will probably give it such directions and inherent influences as may guide and control its course and revolutions for ages to come.* But these plans, being beyond the reach of man to predestinate, are likewise beyond the reach of comment or speculation to say what may or may not be possible, or to predict what events may hereafter be produced by time, climates, soils, adjoining nations, or by the unwieldy magnitude of empire, *and the future population of millions superadded to millions.* The sources of the Mississippi may be unknown; the lines of longitude and latitude may be extended into unexplored regions; and the plan of this new creation may be sketched out by a presumptuous compass, if all its intermediate uses and functions were to be suspended until the final and precise accomplishment, without failure or deviation, of this unbounded plan. But this is not the case; the immediate objects in view are limited and precise; they are of prudent thought, and within the scope of human power to measure out and to execute. The principle, indeed, is indefinite, and will be left to the test of future ages to determine its duration or extent.

“I take the liberty to suggest thus much, lest we should be led away to suppose that the councils which have produced these plans have had no wiser or more sedate views than merely the amusement of drawing meridians of ambition and high thoughts. There appear to me to be two

solid and rational objects in view : the first is, by the sale of lands nearly contiguous to the present States, (receiving Congress paper in payment according to its scale of depreciation,) *to extinguish the present national debt*, which I understand might be discharged for about twelve millions sterling.

“It is a new proposition to be offered to the numerous common rank of mankind in all the countries of the world, to say that there are in America fertile soils and temperate climates in which an acre of land may be purchased for a trifling consideration, which may be possessed in freedom, together with all the natural and civil rights of mankind. The Congress have already proclaimed this, and that no other qualification or name is necessary but to become settlers, without distinction of countries or persons. The European peasant, who toils for his scanty sustenance in penury, wretchedness, and servitude, will eagerly fly to this asylum for free and industrious labor. The tide of emigration may set strongly outward from Scotland, Ireland, and Canada to this new land of promise.

“A very great proportion of men in all the countries of the world are without property, and generally are subject to governments of which they have no participation, and over whom they have no control. The Congress have now opened to all the world a sale of landed settlements where the liberty and property of each individual is to be assigned to his own custody and defence. . . . These are such propositions of free establishments as have never yet been offered to mankind, and cannot fail of producing great effects in the future progress of things. The Congress have arranged their offers in the most inviting and artful terms ; and lest individual peasants and laborers should not have the means of removing themselves, they throw out inducements to moneyed adventurers to purchase and to undertake the settlement by commission and agency, without

personal residence, by stipulating that the lands of proprietors being absentees shall not be higher taxed than the lands of residents. This will quicken the sale of lands, which is their object.

“For the explanation of these points, I beg leave to refer your Lordship to the documents annexed, Nos. 5 and 6, — namely, the Map, and Resolutions of Congress, dated April, 1784. Another circumstance would confirm that it is the intention of Congress to invite moneyed adventurers to make purchases and settlements, which is the precise and mathematical mode of dividing and marking out for sale the lands in each new proposed State. These new States are to be divided by parallel lines running north and south, and by other parallels running east and west. They are to be divided into hundreds of ten geographical miles square, and then again into lots of one square mile. The divisions are laid out as regularly as the squares upon a chessboard, and all to be formed into a Charter of Compact.

“They may be purchased by purchasers at any distance, and the titles may be verified by registers of such or such numbers, north or south, east or west: all this is explained by the document annexed, No. 7, namely, *The Ordinance for ascertaining the mode of locating and disposing of lands in the Western Territory. This is their plan and means for paying off their national debt, and they seem very intent upon doing it.* I should observe that their debt consists of two parts, namely, domestic and foreign. The sale of lands is to be appropriated to the former.

“The domestic debt may perhaps be nine or ten millions, and the foreign debt two or three. For payment of the foreign debt it is proposed to lay a tax of five per cent. upon all imports until discharged, which, I am informed, has already been agreed to by most of the States, and probably will soon be confirmed by the rest. Upon the whole, it appears that this plan is as prudently conceived and as judiciously ar-

ranged, as to the end proposed, as any experienced cabinet of European ministers could have devised or planned any similar project.

“The second point which appears to me to be deserving of attention, respecting the immense cession of territory to the United States at the late peace, is a point *which will perhaps in a few years become an unparalleled phenomenon in the political world.* As soon as the national debt of the United States shall be discharged by the sale of one portion of those lands, we shall then see the Confederate Republic in a new character, as a proprietor of lands either for sale or to let upon rents. While other nations may be struggling under debts too enormous to be discharged either by economy or taxation, and while they may be laboring to raise ordinary and necessary supplies by burdensome impositions upon their own persons and properties, *here will be a nation possessed of a new and unheard-of financial organ of stupendous magnitude, and in process of time of unmeasured value, thrown into their lap as a fortuitous superfluity, and almost without being sought for.*

“When such an organ of revenue begins to arise into produce and exertion, what public uses it may be applicable to, or to what abuses and perversions it might be rendered subservient, is far beyond the reach of probable discussion now. Such discussions would only be visionary speculations. However, thus far it is obvious, and highly deserving of our attention, that it cannot fail becoming to the American States a most important instrument of national power, the progress and operation of which must hereafter be *a most interesting object of attention to the British American dominions which are in close vicinity to the territories of the United States; and I should hope that these considerations would lead us, inasmuch as we value those parts of our dominions, to encourage conciliatory and amicable correspondence between them and their neighbors.*”

This private communication, now for the first time seeing the light, is full of prophecy, or of that remarkable discernment and forecast which mark the prophetic spirit, whether in announcing "the future population of millions superadded to millions," or in the high estimate of the National Territory, destined to become in a few years "an unparalleled phenomenon in the political world," "a new and unheard-of *financial organ* of stupendous magnitude." How few at home saw the Public Lands with as clear a vision as Hartley !

GALIANI, 1776, 1778.

AMONG the most brilliant in this extending list is the Abbé Galiani, the Neapolitan, who was born 1728, and died at Naples 1787. Although Italian by birth, yet by the accident of official residence he became for a while domesticated in France, wrote the French language, and now enjoys a French reputation. His writings in French and his letters have the wit and ease of Voltaire.

Galiani was a genius. Whatever he touched shone at once with his brightness, in which there was originality as well as knowledge. He was a finished scholar, and very successful in lapidary verses. Early in life, while in Italy, he wrote a grave essay on Money, which contrasted with another of rare humor suggested by the death of the public executioner. Other essays followed ; and then came the favor of the congenial pontiff, Benedict the Fourteenth. In 1760 he found himself at Paris as Secretary of the Neapolitan Embassy. Mingling with courtiers officially, according to the duties of his posi-

tion, he fraternized with the liberal and adventurous spirits who exercised such influence over society and literature. He was recognized as one of them, and inferior to none. His petty stature was forgotten when he conversed with inexhaustible faculties of all kinds, so that he seemed an Encyclopædia, Harlequin, and Machiavelli all in one. The atheists at the Thursday dinner of D'Holbach were confounded while he enforced the existence of God. Into the questions of political economy occupying attention at the time he entered with a pen which seemed borrowed from the French Academy. His "Dialogues sur le Commerce des Blés" had the success of a romance: ladies carried this book on Corn in their work-baskets. Returning to Naples, he continued to live in Paris through his correspondence, especially with Madame d'Épinay, the Baron d'Holbach, Diderot, and Grimm.¹

Among later works, after his return to Naples, was a solid volume — not to be forgotten in the History of International Law — on the Duties of Neutrals, where a difficult subject is treated with such mastery, that, more than half a century later, D'Hautefeuille, in his elaborate treatise, copies from it at length. Galiani was the predecessor of this French writer in the extreme assertion of neutral rights. Other works were left at his death in manuscript, some grave and some humorous; also letters without number. The letters preserved from Italian *savans* filled eight large volumes; those from *savans*, ministers, and sovereigns abroad filled fourteen. His Parisian correspondence did not see the light till 1818, although some of the

¹ Biographie Universelle (Michaud). Biographie Générale (Didot). Louis Blanc, Histoire de la Révolution Française, Tom. I. pp. 390, 545 – 551.

letters may be found in the contemporary correspondence of Grimm.

In his Parisian letters, which are addressed chiefly to that clever individuality, Madame d'Épinay, the Neapolitan abbé shows not only the brilliancy and nimbleness of his talent, but the universality of his knowledge and the boldness of his speculations. Here are a few words from a letter dated at Naples, 12th October, 1776, in which he brings forward the idea of "races," so important in our day, with an illustration from Russia:—

*"All depends upon races. The first, the most noble of races, comes naturally from the North of Asia. The Russians are the nearest to it, and this is the reason why they have made more progress in fifty years than can be got out of the Portuguese in five hundred."*¹

Belonging to the Latin race, Galiani was entitled to speak thus freely.

In another letter to Madame d'Épinay, dated at Naples, 18th May, 1776, he had already foretold the success of our Revolution. Few prophets have been more explicit than he was in the following passage:—

*"Livy said of his age, which so strongly resembled ours, 'Ad hæc tempora ventum est, quibus nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus,'—'We are in an age when the remedies hurt at least as much as the vices.'"*² Do you know how matters stand? *The epoch has come of the total downfall of Europe, and of transmigration to America. Everything here is falling into rottenness,—religion, laws,*

¹ Correspondance Inédite, (Paris, 1818,) Tom. II. p. 221. See also Grimm, Correspondance, (Paris, 1812-14,) Tom. IX. p. 282.

² "On est dans un siècle où les remèdes nuisent au moins autant que les vices."

arts, sciences,—and everything is going to be rebuilt anew in America. This is no joke; nor is it an idea drawn from the English quarrels; I have said, announced, preached it, for more than twenty years, and I have always seen my prophecies fulfilled. *Do not buy your house, then, in the Chaussée d'Antin; you must buy it in Philadelphia.* My trouble is, that there are no abbeys in America.”¹

This letter was written some months before the Declaration of Independence.

In another, dated at Naples, 7th February, 1778, the Abbé alludes to the great numbers of English men and women who have come to Naples “for shelter from the American tempests,” and adds, “Meanwhile the Washingtons and Hancocks will be fatal to them.”² In still another, dated at Naples, 25th July, 1778, he renews his prophecies in language still more explicit:—

“You will at this time have decided the greatest revolution of the globe,—namely, *if it is America which is to reign over Europe, or if it is Europe which is to continue to reign over America.* I would wager in favor of America, for the reason, merely physical, that for five thousand years genius has turned opposite to the diurnal motion, and travelled from East to West.”³

Here again is the idea of Berkeley which has been so captivating.

ADAM SMITH, 1776.

IN contrast with the witty Italian is the illustrious philosopher and writer of Scotland, Adam Smith, who

¹ Correspondance Inédite, Tom. II. pp. 202, 203. Grimm, Tom. IX. pp. 284, 285.

² Correspondance Inédite, Tom. II. p. 275.

³ Ibid., p. 280.

was born 5th June, 1723, and died 17th July, 1790. His fame is so commanding that any details of life or works would be out of place. He was thinker and inventor, through whom mankind was advanced in knowledge.

I say nothing of his "Theory of Moral Sentiments," constituting an important contribution to the science of Ethics, but come at once to his great work of political economy, entitled "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations," which first appeared in 1776. Its publication marks an epoch described by Mr. Buckle, when he says that Adam Smith, "by the publication of this single work, contributed more towards the happiness of man than has been effected by the united abilities of all the statesmen and legislators of whom history has preserved an authentic account."¹ The work is full of prophetic knowledge, and especially with regard to the British Colonies. Writing while the debate with the mother country was still pending, Adam Smith urged that they should be admitted to Parliamentary representation in proportion to taxation, so that their representation would enlarge with their growing resources; and here he predicts nothing less than the transfer of empire:—

"The distance of America from the seat of government, the natives of that country might flatter themselves, with some appearance of reason too, would not be of very long continuance. Such has hitherto been the rapid progress of that country in wealth, population, and improvement, that, in the course of little more than a century, perhaps, the produce of American might exceed that of British taxation.

¹ History of Civilization in England, (London, 1857-61,) Chap. IV., Vol. I. p. 197.

*The seat of the empire would then naturally remove itself to that part of the empire which contributed most to the general defence and support of the whole."*¹

In these tranquil words of assured science the great author carries the seat of government across the Atlantic.

Did Adam Smith in this remarkable passage do more than follow a hint from our own prophet? The prophecy of the great economist first appeared in 1776. In the course of 1774, and down to April 19, 1775, John Adams published in the "Boston Gazette" a series of weekly articles, under the signature of "Novanglus," which were abridged in Almon's "Remembrancer" for 1775, with the following title: "History of the Dispute with America, from its Origin in 1754 to the Present Time." Although this abridged edition stops before the prophetic passage, it is not impossible that the whole series was known to Adam Smith. After speculating, as the latter did afterwards, on the extension of the British Constitution and Parliamentary representation to the outlying British dominions, our prophet says:—

"If in twenty years more America should have six millions of inhabitants, as there is a boundless territory to fill up, she must have five hundred representatives. Upon these principles, if in forty years she should have twelve millions, a thousand; and if the inhabitants of the three kingdoms remain as they are, being already full of inhabitants, what will become of your supreme legislative? *It will be translated, crown and all, to America.* This is a sublime system for America. It will flatter those ideas of independ-

¹ *Wealth of Nations*, (London, 1789,) Book IV. Ch. VII. Part 3, Vol. II. p. 458.

ency which the Tories impute to them, if they have any such, more than any other plan of independency that I have ever heard projected.”¹

Thus plainly was John Adams precursor of Adam Smith.

In 1784 these papers were reprinted from the “Remembrancer,” by Stockdale, in London, bearing the same title, substantially, as before, “History of the Dispute with America, from its Origin in 1754,” with the addition, “Written in the Year 1774, by John Adams, Esq.” The “Monthly Review,” in a notice of the publication, after speaking of “the inauspicious system of American taxation,” says, “Mr. Adams foretold the consequence of obstinately adhering to it, and the event hath too well verified his predictions. They were, however, predictions which required no inspiration.”² So that his wise second-sight was recognized in England much beyond the prevision of Adam Smith.

The idea of transferring the seat of government to America was often attributed to Franklin by Dean Tucker. The former, in a letter, as early as 25th November, 1767, reports the Dean as saying, “That is his constant plan.”³ In one of his tracts, the Dean attributes it not only to Franklin, but also to our people. With strange exaggeration he says: “It has been the unanimous opinion of the North Americans for these fifty years past, that the seat of empire ought to be transferred from the lesser to the greater country, — that is, from England to America, or, as Dr. Franklin elegantly phrased it, from the cock-boat to the man-

¹ Novanglus, No. VII.: Works of John Adams, Vol. IV. pp. 101, 102.

² Monthly Review, June, 1784, Vol. LXX. p. 478.

³ Letter to William Franklin, November 25, 1767: Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. VII. p. 367.

of-war.”¹ It is impossible to say how much of this was from the excited brain of the Dean.

RICHARD PRICE, 1776, 1777, 1778, 1784.

A TRUE and solid ally of our country at a critical period was Dr. Price, dissenting clergyman, metaphysician, political writer, and mathematician, who was born in Wales, 23d February, 1723, and died in London, 19th April, 1791.

His earliest labors were “A Review of the Principal Questions and Difficulties in Morals,” by which he was recognized as a metaphysician, and “Observations on Reversionary Payments,” by which he was recognized as an authority on a large class of financial questions. At the same time his sermons were regarded as excellent. Amidst these various labors he was moved to enlist as a pamphleteer in defence of the American Colonies. This service, prompted by a generous devotion to just principles, awakened grateful sentiments on both sides of the ocean.

The Aldermen and Common Council of London marked their sympathy by voting him the freedom of the city in a gold box of fifty pounds value. The American Congress sent him a different testimonial, officially communicated to him, being a solemn resolution declaring “the desire of Congress to consider him a citizen of the United States, and to receive his assistance in regulating their finances.”² In reply,

¹ A Series of Answers to certain Popular Objections against separating from the Rebellious Colonies and discarding them entirely, (Gloucester, 1776,) pp. 58, 59. See also *Cui Bono?* (London, 1782,) p. 87.

² Secret Journals of Congress, October 6, 1778, Vol. II. p. 101. The Commissioners to Dr. Price, December 7, 1778: Works of John Adams, Vol. VII. p. 71.

under date of 18th January, 1779, while declining the invitation, he offered "assurances that Dr. Price feels the warmest gratitude for the notice taken of him, and that he looks to the American States as *now* the hope and likely *soon* to become the refuge of mankind."¹ Franklin and Adams contracted with him relations of friendship. The former, under date of 6th February, 1780, wrote him: "Your writings, after all the abuse you and they have met with, begin to make serious impressions on those who at first rejected the counsels you gave";² and 24th October, 1788, he wrote to another: "Remember me affectionately to good Dr. Price."³ The latter, in correspondence many years afterwards, recorded the intimacy he enjoyed with Dr. Price, "at his own house, at my house, and at the houses and tables of many friends."⁴

The first of his American tracts was in 1776, being "Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty, the Principles of Government, and the Justice and Policy of the War with America." The sale of sixty thousand copies in a few months shows the extensive acceptance of the work. The general principles so clearly exhibited are invoked for America. Occasionally the philosopher becomes prophet, as when he predicts the growth of population:—

"They are now but little short of half our number. To this number they have grown, from a small body of original settlers, by a very rapid increase. The probability is that they will go on to increase, and that in fifty or sixty

¹ Franklin's Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. VIII. p. 355, note.

² *Ibid.*, p. 417.

³ Letter to Benjamin Vaughan: *Ibid.*, Vol. X. p. 365.

⁴ Letter to Jefferson, September 14, 1813: Works, Vol. X. p. 68.

years they will be *double our number, and form a mighty empire, consisting of a variety of States, all equal or superior to ourselves in all the arts and accomplishments which give dignity and happiness to human life.*"¹

Nothing less than "a vast continent" seems to him the sphere of this remarkable development, and he revolts at the idea of this being held "at the discretion of a handful of people on the other side of the Atlantic."² In the measures which brought on the war he saw "the hand of Providence *working to bring about some great ends.*"³ And the vast continent was to be dedicated to Liberty. The excellent man saw even the end of Slavery. Speaking of "the negroes of the Southern Colonies," he said that they "probably will now either soon become extinct or *have their condition changed into that of freemen.*"⁴ Years and battle intervened before this precious result.

This production was followed in 1777 by "Additional Observations on the Nature and Value of Civil Liberty, and the War with America," — to which was added "Observations on Public Loans, the National Debt, and the Debts and Resources of France." In all this variety of topics, his concern for America breaks forth in the inquiry, "Must not humanity shudder at such a war?"⁵ And he sees untold loss to England, which, with the Colonies, "might be the greatest and happiest nation that ever existed"; but without them "we are no more a people; . . . our existence depends on keeping them."⁶ This patriotic gloom is checked by another vision: —

¹ Observations on Civil Liberty, (London, 1776,) pp. 43, 44.

² Ibid., p. 44.

³ Ibid., p. 97.

⁴ Ibid., p. 70, note.

⁵ Additional Observations, (London, 1777,) p. 71.

⁶ Ibid., p. 73.

"These measures have, in all probability, hastened that disruption of the New from the Old World, *which will begin a new era in the annals of mankind*, and produce a revolution more important, perhaps, than any that has happened in human affairs."¹

Thus was American Independence heralded, and its influence foretold.

Constantly sympathizing with America, and impressed by the magnitude of the issue, his soul found another utterance, in 1778, in what he called "The General Introduction and Supplement to the Two Tracts on Civil Liberty, the War with America, and the Finances of the Kingdom." Here again he sees a vision:—

"A great people, likely to be formed, in spite of all our efforts, into free communities, under governments which have no religious tests and establishments. A new era in future annals, and a new opening in human affairs, beginning, among the descendants of Englishmen, in a new world. *A rising empire, extended over an immense continent, without bishops, without nobles, and without kings.*"²

After the recognition of Independence and the establishment of peace, Dr. Price appeared with another tract: "Observations on the Importance of the American Revolution and the Means of making it a Benefit to the World." This was in 1784. And here he repeated the exultation of an earlier day:—

"With heartfelt satisfaction I see the revolution in favor of universal liberty which has taken place in America, — *a revolution which opens a new prospect in human affairs*, and

¹ Additional Observations, p. 87.

² General Introduction, (London, 1778,) pp. xv, xvi.

begins a new era in the history of mankind. . . . Perhaps I do not go too far, when I say, that, next to the introduction of Christianity among mankind, the American Revolution may prove the most important step in the progressive course of human improvement."¹

Thus announcing the grandeur of the epoch, he states that it "may produce a general diffusion of the principles of humanity," and may lead mankind to see and know "that all legitimate government consists in the dominion of *equal laws*, made with common consent," which is another expression of the primal truth of the Declaration of Independence. Then, referring to the "community or confederacy" of States, he says, "I can almost imagine that it is not impossible but that by such means *universal peace* may be produced, and all war excluded from the world"; and he asks, "Why may we not hope to see this begun in America?"² May America be true to this aspiration! There is also a longing for Equality, and a warning against Slavery, with the ejaculation, in harmony with earlier words, "Let the United States continue forever what it is now their glory to be, a confederation of States, prosperous and happy, *without lords, without bishops, and without kings.*"³ In the midst of the bloody conflict this vision had appeared, and he had sought to make it a reality.

His true friendship for our country and his devotion to humanity, with the modesty of his nature, appear in a letter to Franklin, 12th July, 1784, communicating a copy of the last production. After saying that "it is intended entirely for America," the excellent counsellor proceeds:—

¹ Observations on the American Revolution, (London, 1785,) pp. 1-6.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 6, 14, 15.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

"I hope the United States will forgive my presumption in supposing myself qualified to advise them. . . . The consciousness which I have that it is well intended, and that my address to them is the effusion of a heart that wishes to serve the best interests of society, helps to reconcile me to myself in this instance, and it will, I hope, engage the candor of others."¹

The same sentiments which proved his sympathies with our country reappeared with fresh fires at the outbreak of the French Revolution, arousing, in opposition, the immortal eloquence of Burke. A discourse "On the Love of our Country," preached at the Old Jewry, 4th November, 1789, in commemoration of the English Revolution, with friendly glances at what was then passing across the Channel, prompted the "Reflections on the Revolution in France." The personal denunciation which is the beginning of that remarkable performance is the perpetual witness to the position of the preacher, whose prophetic soul did not hesitate to accept the French Revolution side by side with ours in glory and in promise.

GOVERNOR POWNALL, 1777, 1780, 1783.

AMONG the best friends of our country abroad during the trials of the Revolution was Thomas Pownall, called by one biographer "a learned antiquary and politician," and by another "an English statesman and author." Latterly he has so far dropped out of sight that there are few who recognize in him either of these characters. He was born 1722, and died at Bath 1805. During this long period he held several offices. As early as 1745 he became secretary to the Commissioners for

Trade and Plantations. In 1753 he crossed the ocean. In 1755, as Commissioner for Massachusetts Bay, he had a share in the negotiations with New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, in union with New England, which resulted in the confederated expedition against Crown Point. He was afterwards Governor of Massachusetts Bay, New Jersey, and South Carolina, successively. Returning to England, he was appointed, in 1762, Comptroller-General of the army in Germany, with the military rank of colonel. He sat in two successive Parliaments until 1780, when he passed into private life. Hildreth gives a glimpse of his personal character, when, admitting his frank manners and liberal politics, he describes his habits as "rather freer than suited the New England standard."¹

Pownall stands forth conspicuous for championship of our national independence, and especially for foresight with regard to our national future. In both these respects his writings are unique. Other Englishmen were in favor of independence, and saw our future also; but I doubt if any one can be named who was his equal in strenuous action, or in minuteness of foresight. While the war was still proceeding, as early as 1780, he openly announced, not only that independence was inevitable, but that the new nation, "founded in Nature and built up in truth," would continually expand; that its population would increase and multiply; that a civilizing activity beyond what Europe could ever know would animate it; and that its commercial and naval power would be found in every quarter of the globe.² All this he set forth at

¹ History of the United States, Vol. II. p. 476.

² See Memorial to the Sovereigns of Europe (London, 1780).

length with argument and illustration, and he called his prophetic words "the *stating of the simple fact*, so little understood in the Old World." Treated at first as "unintelligible speculation" and as "unfashionable," the truth he announced was "neglected where it was not rejected, but in general rejected as inadmissible," and the author, according to his own language, "was called by the wise men of the British Cabinet a *Wild Man*, unfit to be employed."¹ But these writings are a better title now than any office. In manner they are diffuse and pedantic; but they hardly deserve the cold judgment of John Adams, who in his old age said of them that "a reader who has patience to search for good sense in an uncouth and disgusting style will find in those writings proofs of a thinking mind."²

He seems to have written a good deal. But the works which will be remembered the longest are not even mentioned by several of his biographers. Rose, in his Biographical Dictionary, records works by him, entitled "Antiquities of the Provincia Romana of Gaul"; "Roman Antiquities dug up at Bath"; "Observations on the Currents in the Atlantic Ocean"; "Intellectual Physics"; and contributions to the "Archæologia": nothing more. To this list Gorton, in his Biographical Dictionary, adds briefly, "besides many political tracts," but without particular reference to the works on America. This is another instance where the stone rejected by the builders becomes the head of the corner.

At an early date Pownall comprehended the position of our country, geographically. He saw the wonderful means of internal communication supplied by its inland

¹ Memorial to the Sovereigns of America, (London, 1783,) pp. 73, 74.

² Letter to William Tudor, February 4, 1817: Works, Vol. X. p. 241.

waters, and also the opportunities of external commerce afforded by the Atlantic Ocean. On the former he dwells, in a Memorial drawn up in 1756 for the Duke of Cumberland.¹ Nobody in our own day, after the experience of more than a century, has portrayed more vividly the two vast aqueous masses, — one composed of the Great Lakes and their dependencies, and the other of the Mississippi and its tributaries. The Great Lakes are described as “a wilderness of waters, spreading over the country by an infinite number and variety of branchings, bays, straits, &c.”² The Mississippi, with its eastern branch, called the Ohio, is described as having, “as far as we know, but two falls, — one at a place called by the French St. Antoine, high up on the west or main branch”; and all its waters “run to the ocean with a still, easy, and gentle current.”³ The picture is completed by exhibiting the two masses in combination: —

“The waters of each respective mass — not only the lesser streams, but the main general body of each going through this continent in every course and direction — have, by their approach to each other, by their interlacing with each other, by their communication to every quarter and in every direction, an alliance and unity, and form one mass, a one whole.”⁴

And he remarks, that it is thus seen

“how the watery element claims and holds dominion over this extent of land: that the great lakes which lie upon its bosom on one hand, and the great river Mississippi and the multitude of waters which run into it, form there a communication, — an alliance or dominion of the watery element, that commands throughout the whole; that these great lakes appear to be *the throne, the centre of a dominion*, whose influ-

¹ Administration of the Colonies, (4th edit., London, 1768,) Appendix, pp. 2. *seqq.*

² *Ibid.*, pp. 6, 7.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

ence, by an infinite number of rivers, creeks, and streams, extends itself through all and every part of the continent, supported by the communication of, and alliance with, the waters of Mississippi.”¹

If these means of internal commerce were vast, those afforded by the Atlantic Ocean were not less extensive. The latter were developed in the treatise on “The Administration of the Colonies,” the fourth edition of which, published in 1768, is now before me. This was after the differences between the Colonies and the mother country had begun, but before the idea of independence had shown itself. Pownall insisted that the Colonies ought to be considered as parts of the realm, entitled to representation in Parliament. This was a constitutional unity. But he portrayed a commercial unity also, which he represented in attractive forms. The British Isles, and the British possessions in the Atlantic and in America, were, according to him, “a grand marine dominion,” and ought, therefore, by policy, to be united into one empire, with one centre. On this he dwells at length, and the picture is presented repeatedly.² It was incident to the crisis in the world produced by the predominance of the commercial spirit already beginning to rule the powers of Europe. It was the duty of England to place herself at the head of this great movement:—

“As the rising of this crisis above described forms precisely the *object* on which Government should be employed, so the taking leading measures towards the forming all those Atlantic and American possessions into one empire, of which Great Britain should be the commercial and political centre, is the *precise duty* of Government at this crisis.”³

¹ Administration of the Colonies, (4th edit.,) Appendix, p. 9.

² Administration of the Colonies, pp. 9, 10, 164.

³ Ibid., p. 10.

This was his desire. But he saw clearly the resources as well as the rights of the Colonies, and was satisfied, that, if power were not consolidated under the constitutional auspices of England, it would be transferred to the other side of the Atlantic. Here his words are prophetic:—

“The whole train of events, the whole course of business, must perpetually bring forward into practice, and necessarily in the end into establishment, *either an American or a British union*. There is no other alternative.”¹

The necessity for union is enforced in a manner which foreshadows our National Union:—

“The Colonial Legislature does certainly not answer all purposes,—is incompetent and inadequate to many purposes. Something, therefore, more is necessary,—*either a common union amongst themselves*, or a one common union of subordination under the one general legislature of the state.”²

Then, again, in another place of the same work, after representing the declarations of power over the Colonies as little better than mockery, he prophesies:—

“Such is the actual state of the really existing system of our dominions, that *neither the power of government over these various parts can long continue under the present mode of administration*, nor the great interest of commerce extended throughout the whole long subsist under the present system of the laws of trade.”³

Recent events may give present interest to his views, in this same work, on the nature and necessity of a paper currency, where he follows Franklin. The prin-

¹ Administration of the Colonies, Dedication, p. xviii.

² *Ibid.*, p. 165.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

cial points of his plan were : That bills of credit, to a certain amount, should be printed in England for the use of the Colonies ; that a loan-office should be established in each Colony, to issue bills, take securities, and receive the payments ; that the bills should be issued for ten years, bearing interest at five per cent.,—one tenth part of the sum borrowed to be paid annually, with the interest ; and that they should be a legal tender.¹

When the differences had flamed forth in war, then the prophet became more earnest. His utterances deserve to be rescued from oblivion. He was open, almost defiant. As early as 2d December, 1777, some months before our treaty with France, he declared, from his place in Parliament, that "the sovereignty of this country over America is abolished and gone forever" ; that "they are determined at all events to be independent, *and they will be so*" ; and that "all the treaty that this country can ever expect with America is federal, and that, probably, only commercial." In this spirit he said to the House :—

"Until you shall be convinced that you are no longer sovereigns over America, but that the United States are an independent, sovereign people,—until you are prepared to treat with them as such,—it is of no consequence at all what schemes or plans of conciliation this side the House or that may adopt."²

The position taken in Parliament he maintained by writings ; and here he depicted the great destinies of

¹ Administration of the Colonies, pp. 240, 241. See also Franklin's Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. II. pp. 353, 354, note.

² Hansard's Parliamentary History, Vol. XIX. col. 527, 528. See also col. 1137.

our country. He began with "A Memorial to the Sovereigns of Europe," published early in 1780, and afterwards, through the influence of John Adams, while at the Hague, abridged and translated into French. In this remarkable production independence was the least that he claimed for us. Thus he foretells our future:—

"North America is become a new primary planet in the system of the world, which, while it takes its own course, in its own orbit, must have effect on the orbit of every other planet, and shift the common centre of gravity of the whole system of the European world. North America is *de facto* an independent power, which has taken its equal station with other powers, and must be so *de jure*. . . . The independence of America is fixed as Fate. She is mistress of her own fortune, knows that she is so, and will actuate that power which she feels she hath, so as to establish her own system and to change the system of Europe."¹

Not only is the new power to take an independent place, but it is "to change the system of Europe." For all this its people are amply prepared. "Standing on that high ground of improvement up to which the most enlightened parts of Europe have advanced, like eaglets they commence the first efforts of their pinions from a towering advantage."² This same conviction appears in another form:—

"North America has advanced and is every day advancing to growth of state with a steady and continually accelerating motion, of which there has never yet been any example in Europe."³ "It is a vitality, liable indeed to many disorders, many dangerous diseases; but it is young and strong, and will struggle, by the vigor of internal healing principles of

¹ Memorial to the Sovereigns of Europe, (London, 1780, 2d edit.,) pp. 4, 5.

² *Ibid.*, p. 43.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

life, against those evils, and surmount them. . . . Its strength will grow with its years."¹

He then dwells in detail on "the progressive population" of the country; on its advantage in lying "on another side of the globe, where it has no enemy"; on the products of the soil, among which is "bread-corn to a degree that has wrought it to a staple export for the supply of the Old World"; on the fisheries, which he calls "mines producing more solid riches to those who work them than all the silver of Potosi"; on the inventive spirit of the people; and on their commercial activity.² Of such a people it is easy to predict great things; and our prophet announces, —

1. That the new state will be "a great naval power," exercising a peculiar influence on commerce, and, through commerce, on the political system of the Old World, — becoming the arbitress of commerce, and perhaps the mediatrix of peace.³

2. That shipbuilding and the science and art of navigation have made such progress in America that her people will be able to build and navigate cheaper than any country in Europe, even Holland, with all her economy.⁴

3. That the peculiar articles to be had from America only, and so much sought in Europe, must give Americans a preference in those markets.⁵

4. That a people "whose empire stands singly predominant in a great continent" can hardly "suffer in their borders the establishment of such a monopoly as the European Hudson's Bay Company"; that it cannot

¹ Memorial to the Sovereigns of Europe, (2d edit.,) pp. 68, 69.

² Ibid., pp. 56-63, 69, 70.

³ Ibid., pp. 74, 77.

⁴ Ibid., p. 82.

⁵ Ibid., p. 83.

be stopped by Cape Horn or the Cape of Good Hope; that before long "they will be found trading in the South Sea and in China"; and that "the Dutch will hear of them in Spice Islands."¹

5. That by constant intercommunion of business and correspondence, and by increased knowledge with regard to the ocean, "America will seem every day to approach nearer and nearer to Europe"; that "a thousand attractive motives will . . . become the irresistible cause of *an almost general emigration to that New World*"; and that "many of the most useful, enterprising spirits, and much of the active property, will go there also."²

6. That "North America will become a *free port* to all the nations of the world indiscriminately, and will expect, insist on, and demand, in fair reciprocity, a *free market* in all those nations with whom she trades"; and that, adhering to this principle, she must be, "in the course of time, the chief carrier of the commerce of the whole world."³

7. That America must avoid complication with European politics, or "the entanglement of alliances," having no connections with Europe "other than merely commercial";⁴—all of which at a later day was put forth by Washington in his Farewell Address, when he said: "The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible"; and also when he asked: "Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, en-

¹ Memorial to the Sovereigns of Europe, (2d edit.) p. 85.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 86, 87.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

tangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?"¹

8. That "the similar modes of living and thinking, the same manners and same fashions, the same language, and old habits of national love, impressed in the heart and not yet effaced, *the very indentings of the fracture whereat North America stands broken off from England, all conspire naturally to a rejuncture by alliance.*"²

9. That the sovereigns of Europe, who "have despised the unfashioned, awkward youth of America," and have neglected to interweave their interests with the rising States, when they find the system of the new empire not only obstructing, but superseding, the old system of Europe, and crossing all their settled maxims, will call upon their ministers and wise men, "Come, curse me this people, for they are too mighty for me."³

This remarkable appeal was followed by two Memorials, "drawn up solely for the King's use, and designed solely for his eye,"⁴ dated at Richmond, January 2, 1782, where the author most persuasively urges his Majesty to "treat with the Americans as with free states *de facto*, under a truce."⁵ And on the signature of the treaty of peace he wrote a private letter to Franklin, dated at Richmond, 28th February, 1783, where he testifies to the magnitude of the event:—

"MY OLD FRIEND, — I write this to congratulate you on the establishment of your country as a free and sovereign power, taking its equal station amongst the powers of this world. I congratulate you, in particular, as chosen by Providence to be a principal instrument of this great Revolution,

¹ Writings, ed. Sparks, Vol. XII. pp. 231, 232.

² Memorial to the Sovereigns of Europe, (2d edit.,) p. 93.

³ Ibid., p. 91.

⁴ Two Memorials, (London, 1782,) Preface, p. 1.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 20, 33.

*—a Revolution that has stronger marks of Divine interposition, superseding the ordinary course of human affairs, than any other event which this world has experienced.”*¹

The prophet closes his letter by allusion to a proposed tour of America, adding, that, “if there ever was an object worth the travelling to see, and worthy of the contemplation of a philosopher, it is that in which he may see the beginnings of a great empire at its foundation.” He communicated this purpose also to John Adams, who answered him, that “he would be received respectfully in every part of America, that he had always been considered as friendly to America, and that his writings had been useful to our cause.”²

Then came another work, first published in 1783, entitled “A Memorial addressed to the Sovereigns of America,” of which he gave the mistaken judgment to a private friend, that it was “the best thing he ever wrote.”³ Here for the first time American citizens are called “sovereigns.” At the beginning he explains, and indicates the simplicity with which he addresses them:—

“Having presumed to address to the Sovereigns of Europe a Memorial, . . . permit me now to address this Memorial to you Sovereigns of America. I shall not address you with the court titles of Gothic Europe, nor with those of servile Asia. I will neither address your Sublimity or Majesty, your Grace or Holiness, your Eminence or Highmightiness, your Excellence or Honors. What are titles, where things themselves are known and understood? What title did the

¹ Franklin's Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. IX. p. 491.

² Letter to the President of Congress, February 10, 1784: Works, Vol. VIII. p. 179.

³ Letter to John Nichols, February 8, 1788: Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes*, Vol. VIII. p. 112, note.

Republic of Rome take? The state was known to be sovereign, and the citizens to be free. What could add to this glory? Therefore, United States and Citizens of America, I address you as you are."¹

Here again are the same constant sympathy with Liberty, the same confidence in our national destinies, and the same aspirations for our prosperity, mingled with warnings against disturbing influences. He exhorts that all our foundations should be "laid in Nature"; that there should be "no contention for, nor acquisition of, unequal domination in men"; and that union should be established on the attractive principle by which all are drawn to a common centre.² He fears difficulty in making the line of frontier between us and the British Provinces "a line of peace," as it ought to be; he is anxious lest something may break out between us and Spain; and he suggests that possibly, "in the cool hours of unimpassioned reflection," we may learn the danger of our "alliances,"³—referring plainly to that original alliance with France which at a later day was the occasion of such trouble. Two other warnings occur. One is against Slavery,⁴ which is more memorable, because in an earlier Memorial he enumerates among articles of commerce "African slaves, carried by a circuitous trade in American shipping to the West India markets."⁵ The other warning is thus strongly expressed:—

"Every inhabitant of America is, *de facto* as well as *de jure*, equal, in his essential, inseparable rights of the individual, to any other individual,—is, in these rights, inde-

¹ Memorial to the Sovereigns of America, (London, 1783,) pp. 5-7.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 16, 21, 22, 37.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 108-110.

⁵ Memorial to the Sovereigns of Europe, p. 83.

pendent of any power that any other can assume over him, over his labor, or his property. This is a principle in act and deed, and not a mere speculative theorem.”¹

This strange and striking testimony, all from one man, is enhanced by his farewell words to Franklin. As Pownall heard that the great philosopher and negotiator was about to embark for the United States, he wrote to him from Lausanne, 3d July, 1785:—

“Adieu, my dear friend. You are going to a New World, formed to exhibit a scene which the Old World never yet saw. You leave me here in the Old World, which, like myself, begins to feel, as Asia hath felt, that it is wearing out apace. We shall never meet again on this earth; but there is another world where we shall meet, and *where we shall be understood.*”²

The correspondence was continued across the intervening ocean. In a letter to Franklin, dated at Bristol, 8th April, 1788, the same devoted reformer refers to the Congress at Albany in 1754, “when the events which have since come into fact first began to develop themselves, as ready to burst into bloom, and to bring forth the fruits of Liberty which you in America at present enjoy.” He is cheered in his old age by the proceedings in the Convention to frame a Constitution, with Franklin’s “report of a system of sovereignty founded in law, and above which law only was sovereign”; and he begins “to entertain hopes for the liberties of America, and for what will be an asylum one day or other to a remnant of mankind who wish and deserve to live with political liberty.” His disturbance

¹ Memorial to the Sovereigns of America, p. 55.

² Franklin's Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. X. p. 200.

at the Presidential term breaks out: "I have some fears of mischief from *the orbit of four years' period* which you give to the rotation of the office of President. It may become the ground of intrigue."¹ Here friendly anxiety is elevated by hope, where America appears as the asylum of Liberty.

Clearly Pownall was not understood in his time; but it is evident that he understood our country as few Englishmen since have been able to understand it.

How few of his contemporaries saw America with his insight and courage! The prevailing sentiment was typified in the conduct of George the Third, so boldly arraigned in the Declaration of Independence. Individual opinions also attest the contrast, and help to glorify Pownall. Thus, Shirley, like himself a Massachusetts governor, in advising the King to strengthen Louisburg, wrote, under date of July 10, 1745:—

"It would, by its vicinity to the British Colonies, and being the key of 'em, give the Crown of Great Britain a most absolute hold and command of 'em, if ever there should come a time when they should go restiff and disposed to shake off their dependency upon their mother country, *the possibility of which seems some centuries further off than it does to some gentlemen at home.*"²

Nothing of the prophet here. Nor was Hume more penetrating in his History first published, although he commemorates properly the early settlement of the country:—

"What chiefly renders the reign of James memorable is the commencement of the English colonies in America, col-

¹ Franklin's Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. X. pp. 343, 344.

² Palfrey's Compendious History of New England, 1723-65, p. 180.

onies established on the noblest footing that has been known in any age or nation. . . .

"Speculative reasoners during that age raised many objections to the planting those remote colonies, and foretold, that, after draining their mother country of inhabitants, they would soon shake off her yoke, and erect an independent government in America; but time has shown that the views entertained by those who encouraged such generous undertakings were more just and solid. *A mild government and great naval force have preserved, and may long preserve, the dominion of England over her colonies.*"¹

In making the reign of James chiefly memorable by the Colonies, the eminent historian shows a just appreciation of events; but he seems to have written hastily, and rather from imagination than evidence, when he announces contemporary prophecy, "that, after draining their mother country of inhabitants, they would soon shake off her yoke, and erect an independent government in America," and is plainly without prophetic instinct with regard to "the dominion of England over her colonies."

CÉRISIER, 1778, 1780.

AGAIN a Frenchman appears on our list, Antoine Marie Cérasier, who was born at Châtillon-les-Dombes, 1749, and died 1st July, 1828, after a checkered existence. Being Secretary of the French Legation at the Hague, he early became interested in the history of Holland and her heroic struggle for independence. An elaborate work in ten volumes on the "General History

¹ History of England, (London, 1763, 4to,) Vol. V. pp. 126, 127, Appendix to Reign of James I., *Colonies*.

of the United Provinces,"¹ appearing first in French and afterwards translated into Dutch, attests his industry and zeal, and down to this day is accepted as the best in French literature on this interesting subject. Naturally the historian of the mighty effort to overthrow the domination of Spain sympathized with the kindred effort in America. In a series of works he bore his testimony to our cause.

John Adams was received at the Hague as American Minister, 19th April, 1782. In his despatch to Secretary Livingston, 16th May, 1782, he wrote: "How shall I mention another gentleman, whose name, perhaps, Congress never heard, but who, in my opinion, has done more decided and essential service to the American cause and reputation, within these last eighteen months, than any other man in Europe?" Then, after describing him as "beyond all contradiction one of the greatest historians and political characters in Europe, . . . possessed of the most genuine principles and sentiments of liberty, and exceedingly devoted by principle and affection to the American cause," our minister announces: "His pen has erected a monument to the American cause more glorious and more durable than brass or marble. His writings have been read like oracles, and his sentiments weekly echoed and reëchoed in gazettes and pamphlets."² And yet these have passed out of sight.

First in time was an elaborate work in French, purporting to be translated from the English, which appeared at Utrecht in 1778, entitled, "History of the Founding of the Colonies of the Ancient Republics,

¹ *Tableau de l'Histoire Générale des Provinces-Unies* (Utrecht, 1777–84).

² *Works*, Vol. VII. pp. 589, 590.

adapted to the present Dispute of Great Britain with her American Colonies.”¹ Learning and philosophy were elevated by visions of the future. With the representation of the Colonies in Parliament, he foresees the time when “the influence of America will become preponderant in Parliament, and *able, perhaps, to transfer the seat of empire to their country*, and so, without danger and without convulsive agitation, render this immense continent, already so favorably disposed by Nature to that end, the theatre of one of the greatest and freest governments that have ever existed.”² Then indulging in another vision, where French emigrants and Canadians, already invited to enter the Confederacy, mingle with English colonists, he beholds at the head of the happy settlements “men known for their superior genius, their politics friendly to humanity, and their enthusiasm for liberty,” and he catches the strains of ancient dramatists, “whose masterpieces would breathe and inspire a hatred of tyrants and despots.” Then touching a practical point in government, he exclaims: “The human species there would not be debased, outraged by that odious and barbarous distinction of nobles and plebeians, as if anybody could be more or less than a man.” And then again: “Could not that admirable democracy which I have so often pleased myself in tracing be established there?”³

This was followed in the same year by another publication, also in French, entitled “Impartial Observations of a True Hollander, in Answer to the Address

¹ Histoire de la Fondation des Colonies des Anciennes Républiques, adaptée à la Dispute présente de la Grande-Bretagne avec ses Colonies Américaines (Utrecht, 1778).

² Ibid., p. 155.

³ Ibid., p. 176.

of a self-styled Good Hollander to his Countrymen." ¹ Here there is no longer question of Colonial representation in Parliament, or of British empire transferred to America, but of separation, with its lofty future:—

"This revolution is, then, the most fortunate event which could happen to the human species in general and to all the States in particular. In short, tender souls see with transport that reparation at last is to be made for the crime of those who discovered and devastated this immense continent, and recognize the United States of North America as replacing the numerous nations which European cruelty has caused to disappear from South America." ²

Addressing Englishmen directly, the Frenchman thus counsels:—

"Englishmen! you must needs submit to your destiny, and renounce a people who do not wish longer to recognize you. To avoid giving them any uneasiness, and to prevent all dispute in the future, *have the courage to abandon to them all the neighboring countries which have not yet shaken off your yoke.*" ³

Then turning to his own countrymen:—

"*Let Canada make a fourteenth confederate State.* What glory for you to have labored first for this interesting revolution! What glory for you that these settlements, sprung from your bosom, should be associated with a powerful confederation, and govern themselves as a Republic!" ⁴

The idea of Canada as "a fourteenth confederate State" was in unison with the aspiration and invitation of the Continental Congress.

¹ Observations Impartiales d'un Vrai Hollandois, pour servir de Réponse au Discours d'un soi-disant Bon Hollandois à ses Compatriotes (Amsterdam, etc., 1778).

² Ibid., p. 15.

³ Ibid., p. 58.

⁴ Ibid.

Another friendly work in French, pretending to be from the English, saw the light in 1780, and is entitled "The Destiny of America; or, Picturesque Dialogues."¹ Among the parties to the colloquies are Lord North, with other English personages, and a Philosopher, who must be the author. Among the topics considered are the causes of current events, the policy of European powers relative to the war, and the influence it must have on the happiness of mankind. In answer to Lord North, who asks, "What are these precious means [of saving our honor and interests]?" the Philosopher replies: "Commence by proclaiming the independence of the thirteen revolted Colonies, of Florida, and of *Canada*; . . . then, in a manner not less solemn, renounce Jamaica, Barbadoes, and all your Windward Islands."² This is to be followed by the freedom of the Spanish and French colonies,—also of the Dutch, the Portuguese, and the Danish. Then, rising in aspiration, the Philosopher, exalting the good of humanity over that of any nation, proclaims that the root of future wars must be destroyed, that the ocean may not be reddened with blood; but this destiny will be postponed, "if America does not become entirely free."³ Then, looking forward to the time when nations will contend on the ocean only in commercial activity, and man will cease to be the greatest enemy of man, he declares: "If Perpetual Peace could be more than the dream of honest men, what event could accelerate it more than the independence of the two Americas?"⁴ Confessing that he does not expect the applause of the present age, he concludes, "My heart tells me that I shall have the acknowledg-

¹ *Le Destin de l'Amérique, ou Dialogues Pittoresques* (Londres, 1780).

² *Ibid.*, p. 109.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 113, 114.

ment of all free and tender souls, and the suffrage of posterity.”¹ Most surely he has mine. Nothing can be happier than the thought that Perpetual Peace would be accelerated by American freedom, thus enhancing even this great boon.

SIR WILLIAM JONES, 1781.

I AM glad to enter upon our list the name of this illustrious scholar, who was born in London, 28th September, 1746, and died in Calcutta, 27th April, 1794.

If others have excelled Sir William Jones in different departments of human activity, no Englishman has attained equal eminence in so many, and at the same time borne the priceless crown of character. His wonderful attainments and his various genius excite admiration, but his goodness awakens love. It is pleasant to know that his benediction rests upon our country.

From boyhood to his last breath he was always industrious, thus helping the generous gifts of Nature, — and it is not easy to say where he was most eminent. As a jurist, he is memorable for the “*Essay on the Law of Bailments*,” undoubtedly at the time it appeared the most complete and beautiful contribution to the science of jurisprudence in the English language. As a judge, he was the voice of the law and of justice, so that his appointment to a high judicial station in India was called “the greatest blessing ever conferred by the British Government on the inhabitants of the East.”² As a linguist, knowing no less than twenty-eight languages, he was the predecessor of Baron William Humboldt, and

¹ *Le Destin de l'Amérique*, p. 115.

² *Meadley's Memoirs of Paley*, (2d edit., Edinburgh, 1810,) p. 221.

the less scholarly prodigy, Mezzofanti, while as a philologist he will find a parallel in the former rather than the latter. As an Orientalist, he was not only the first of his time, but the pioneer through whom the literature of the East was opened to European study and curiosity. As a poet, he is enshrined forever by his Ode modestly called "An Ode in Imitation of Alcæus,"¹ and doubtless inspired by sympathy with the American cause:—

"What constitutes a State?
Not high-raised battlement or labored mound,
Thick wall or moated gate;
Not cities proud with spires and turrets crowned;
Not bays and broad-armed ports,
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Not starred and spangled courts,
Where low-browed Baseness wafts perfume to Pride:
No; MEN, high-minded MEN,
Men, who their *duties* know,
But know their *rights*, and, knowing, dare maintain;
Prevent the long-aimed blow,
And crush the tyrant while they rend the chain:
*These constitute a State."*²

To all these accomplishments add the glowing emotions of his noble nature, his love of virtue, his devotion to freedom, his sympathy for the poor and down-trodden. His biographer records as "a favorite opinion of Sir William Jones, that all men are born with *an equal capacity for improvement*,"³ and also reports him as saying: "I see chiefly under the sun the two classes of men whom Solomon describes, the oppressor and the oppressed. . . . I shall cultivate my fields and gardens, and think as little as possible of monarchs or oligarchs."⁴

¹ Dated Abergavenny, March 31, 1781.

² Works, (London, 1807,) Vol. X. p. 389.

³ Teignmouth, Life of Sir William Jones, prefixed to Works, Vol. II. p. 299, note.

⁴ Letter to Teignmouth, October, 1793: Ibid., p. 229.

With these declarations it is easy to credit Dr. Paley, who said of him, "He was a great republican when I knew him."¹ Like seeks like, and a long intimacy in the family of the good Bishop of St. Asaph,² ending in a happy marriage with his eldest daughter, shows how he must have sympathized with the American cause and with the future of our country.

Our author had been the tutor of Lord Althorp, the same who, as Earl Spencer, became so famous a bibliophile and a patron of Dibdin, and on the marriage of his pupil with Miss Lavinia Bingham, he was moved to commemorate it in a poem, entitled "The Muse Recalled: an Ode on the Nuptials of Lord Viscount Althorp and Miss Lavinia Bingham, eldest Daughter of Charles Lord Lucan, March 6, 1781,"³ which his critic, Wraxall, calls "one of the most beautiful lyric productions in the English language, . . . emulating at once the fame of Milton and of Gray."⁴ But beyond the strain of personal sympathy, congenial to the occasion, was a passion for America, and the prophetic spirit which belongs to the poet. Lamenting that Freedom and Concord are repudiated by the sons of Albion, all the Virtues disappear, —

"Truth, Justice, Reason, Valor, with them fly
To seek a purer soil, a more congenial sky."

But the soil and sky which they seek are of the Delaware: —

"Beyond the vast Atlantic deep
A dome by viewless genii shall be raised,
The walls of adamant, compact and steep,
The portals with sky-tinctured gems emblazed:

¹ Meadley's *Memoirs of Paley*, (2d edit.,) p. 221.

² Dr. Jonathan Shipley. See, *ante*, pp. 82, seqq.

³ Works, Vol. X. pp. 381, seqq.

⁴ *Historical Memoirs of his own Time*, (London, 1836,) March, 1781, Vol. II. p. 378.

There on a lofty throne shall Virtue stand ;
 To her the youth of Delaware shall kneel ;
 And when her smiles reign plenty o'er the land,
 Bow, tyrants, bow beneath the avenging steel !
Commerce with fleets shall mock the waves,
And Arts, that flourish not with slaves,
Dancing with every Grace and every Muse,
Shall bid the valleys laugh and heavenly beams diffuse."

Wraxall remarks, that "here, in a fine frenzy of inspiration," the poet "seems to behold, as in a vision, the modern Washington and the Congress met, after successfully throwing off all subjection to Great Britain," while "George the Third is pretty clearly designated in the line apostrophizing tyrants."¹ But to an American the most captivating verses are those which open the vista of peaceful triumphs, where Commerce and the Arts unite with every Grace and every Muse.

Kindred in sentiment were other contemporary verses by the anonymous author of the "Heroic Epistle to Sir William Chambers," now understood to be the poet Mason,² which Wraxall praises for their beauty, but condemns for their politics.³ After describing the corruption of the House of Commons under Lord North, the poet declares that it will augment in enormity and profligacy, —

"Till, mocked and jaded with the puppet play,
 Old England's genius turns with scorn away,
 Ascends his sacred bark, the sails unfurled,
And steers his state to the wide Western World.
 High on the helm majestic Freedom stands ;
 In act of cold contempt she waves her hands :
 'Take, slaves,' she cries, 'the realms that I disown,
 Renounce your birthright, and destroy my throne !'"⁴

¹ Historical Memoirs, March, 1781, Vol. II. p. 379.

² Walpole's Journal of the Reign of George III., March, 1773, Vol. I. p. 187, note.

³ Historical Memoirs, March, 1781, Vol. II. p. 377.

⁴ An Epistle to Dr. Shebbeare, by the Author of "An Heroic Epistle to Sir William Chambers," (London, 1777.) 214-221. See Poems of William Mason, in Chalmers's English Poets, Vol. XVIII. pp. 416-418.

The two poets united in a common cause. One transported to the other side of the Atlantic the virtues which had been the glory of Britain, and the other carried there nothing less than the sovereign genius of the great nation itself.

COUNT ARANDA, 1783.

THE Count Aranda was one of the first of Spanish statesmen and diplomatists, and one of the richest subjects of Spain in his day ; born at Saragossa, 1718, and died 1799. He, too, is one of our prophets. Originally a soldier, he became ambassador, governor of a province, and prime-minister. In this last post he displayed character as well as ability, and was the benefactor of his country. He drove the Jesuits from Spain, and dared to oppose the Inquisition. He was a philosopher, and, like Pope Benedict the Fourteenth, corresponded with Voltaire. Such a liberal spirit was out of place in Spain. Compelled to resign in 1773, he found a retreat at Paris as ambassador, where he came into communication with Franklin, Adams, and Jay, and finally signed the Treaty of 1783, by which Spain recognized our independence. Shortly afterwards he returned to Spain, and in 1792 took the place of Florida Blanca as prime-minister for the second time. He was emphatically a statesman, and as such did not hesitate to take responsibility even contrary to express orders. An instance of this civic courage was when, for the sake of peace between Spain and England, he accepted the Floridas instead of Gibraltar, on which the eminent French publicist, M. Rayneval, remarks that "history

furnishes few examples of such a character and such self-devotion.”¹

Franklin, on meeting him, records, in his letter to the Secret Committee of Correspondence, that he seemed “well disposed towards us.”² Some years afterwards he had another interview with him, which he thus chronicles in his journal:—

“*Saturday, June 29th* [1782]. — We went together to the Spanish Ambassador’s, who received us with great civility and politeness. He spoke with Mr. Jay on the subject of the treaty they were to make together. . . . On our going out, he took pains himself to open the folding-doors for us, which is a high compliment here, and told us he would return our visit (*rendre son devoir*), and then fix a day with us for dining with him.”³

Adams, in his Diary,⁴ describes a Sunday dinner at his house, then a new building in “the finest situation in Paris,” being part of the incomparable palace, with its columnar front, still admired as it looks on the Place de la Concorde. Jay also describes a dinner with the Count, who was living “in great splendor,” with an “assortment of wines perhaps the finest in Europe,” and was “the ablest Spaniard he had ever known”; showing by his conversation “that his court is in earnest,” and appearing “frank and candid, as well as sagacious.”⁵ These hospitalities have a peculiar interest, when it is known, as it now is, that Count Aranda regarded the acknowledgment of our independence with “grief and

¹ *Institutions du Droit de la Nature et des Gens*, (Paris, 1851,) Tom. II. p. 311.

² Paris, January 4, 1777: Works, ed. Sparks, Vol. VIII. p. 194.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. IX. pp. 350, 351.

⁴ June 1, 1783: Works, Vol. III. pp. 378, 379.

⁵ *Life of John Jay*, by his Son, Vol. I. p. 140; Vol. II. p. 101.

dread." But these sentiments were disguised from our ministers.

After signing the Treaty of Paris, by which Spain recognized our independence, Aranda addressed a Memoir secretly to King Charles the Third, in which his opinions on this event are set forth. This prophetic document slumbered for a long time in the confidential archives of the Spanish crown. Coxe, in his "Memoirs of the Kings of Spain of the House of Bourbon," which are founded on a rare collection of original documents, makes no allusion to it. It was first brought to light in a French translation of Coxe's work by Don Andres Muriel, published at Paris in 1827.¹ An abstract of the Memoir appears in one of the historical dissertations of the Mexican authority, Alaman, who said of it that it has "a just celebrity, because results have made it pass for a prophecy."² I give the material portions, translated from the French of Muriel.

"Memoir communicated secretly to the King by his Excellency the Count Aranda, on the Independence of the English Colonies, after having signed the Treaty of Paris of 1783.

"The independence of the English Colonies has been acknowledged. This is for me an occasion of grief and dread. France has few possessions in America; but she should have considered that Spain, her intimate ally, has

¹ L'Espagne sous les Rois de la Maison de Bourbon, ou Mémoires relatifs à l'Histoire de cette Nation, depuis l'Avènement de Philippe V. en 1700 jusqu'à la Mort de Charles III. en 1788. Écrits en Anglais sur des Documents originaux inédits, par William Coxe; traduits en Français, avec des Notes et des Additions, par Don Andres Muriel. Paris, 1827. Tom. VI. pp. 45-54, Chap. III. additionnel. — The document in question is cited as a manuscript in the "Collection de M. le duc de San Fernando."

² Disertaciones sobre la Historia de la República Mejicana, (Méjico, 1849,) Tom. III. p. 351.

many, and that she is left to-day exposed to terrible shocks. From the beginning, France has acted contrary to her true interests in encouraging and seconding this independence : I have often so declared to the ministers of this nation. What could happen better for France than to see the English and the Colonists destroy each other in a party warfare which could only augment her power and favor her interests ? The antipathy which reigns between France and England blinded the French Cabinet ; it forgot that its interest consisted in remaining a tranquil spectator of this conflict ; and, once launched in the arena, it dragged us, unhappily, and by virtue of the Family Compact, into a war entirely contrary to our proper interest.

“I will not stop here to examine the opinions of some statesmen, our own countrymen as well as foreigners, which I share, on *the difficulty of preserving our power in America. Never have so extensive possessions, placed at a great distance from the metropolis, been long preserved.* To this cause, applicable to all colonies, must be added others peculiar to the Spanish possessions : namely, the difficulty of succoring them, in case of need ; the vexations to which the unhappy inhabitants have been exposed from some of the governors ; the distance of the supreme authority to which they must have recourse for the redress of grievances, which causes years to pass before justice is done to their complaints ; the vengeance of the local authorities to which they continue exposed while waiting ; the difficulty of knowing the truth at so great a distance ; finally, the means which the viceroys and governors, from being Spaniards, cannot fail to have for obtaining favorable judgments in Spain : all these different circumstances will render the inhabitants of America discontented, and make them attempt efforts to obtain independence as soon as they shall have a propitious occasion.

“Without entering into any of these considerations, I shall confine myself now to that which occupies us from the dread

of seeing ourselves exposed to dangers from the new power which we have just recognized in a country where there is no other in condition to arrest its progress. *This Federal Republic is born a pygmy*, so to speak. It required the support and the forces of two powers as great as Spain and France in order to attain independence. *A day will come when it will be a giant, even a colossus, formidable in these countries.* It will then forget the benefits which it has received from the two powers, and will dream of nothing but to aggrandize itself. *Liberty of conscience, the facility for establishing a new population on immense lands, as well as the advantages of the new government, will draw thither agriculturists and artisans from all the nations: for men always run after Fortune.* And in a few years we shall see with true grief the tyrannical existence of this same colossus of which I speak.

“The first movement of this power, when it has arrived at its aggrandizement, will be to obtain possession of the Floridas, in order to dominate the Gulf of Mexico. After having rendered commerce with New Spain difficult for us, it will aspire to the conquest of this vast empire, which it will not be possible for us to defend against a formidable power established on the same continent, and in its neighborhood. These fears are well founded, Sire; they will be changed into reality in a few years, if, indeed, there are not other disorders in our Americas still more fatal. This observation is justified by what has happened in all ages, and with all nations which have begun to rise. Man is the same everywhere; the difference of climate does not change the nature of our sentiments; he who finds the opportunity of acquiring power and of aggrandizing himself profits by it always. How, then, can we expect the Americans to respect the kingdom of New Spain, when they shall have the facility of possessing themselves of this rich and beautiful country? A wise policy counsels us to take precautions against evils which may happen. This thought has occupied my whole

mind, since, as Minister Plenipotentiary of your Majesty, and conformably to your royal will and instructions, I signed the Peace of Paris. I have considered this important affair with all the attention of which I am capable, and, after much reflection, drawn from the knowledge, military as well as political, which I have been able to acquire in my long career, I think, that, in order to escape the great losses with which we are threatened, there remains nothing but the means which I am about to have the honor of exhibiting to your Majesty.

"Your Majesty must relieve yourself of all your possessions on the continent of the two Americas, *preserving only the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico* in the northern part, and some other convenient one in the southern part, to serve as a seaport or trading-place for Spanish commerce.

"In order to accomplish this great thought in a manner becoming to Spain, three Infantes must be placed in America, — one as king of Mexico, another as king of Peru, and the third as king of the Terra Firma. Your Majesty will take the title of Emperor."

I have sometimes heard this remarkable Memoir called apocryphal, but without reason, except because its foresight is so remarkable. The Mexican historian Alaman treats it as genuine, and, after praising it, informs us that the project of Count Aranda was not taken into consideration, but that "the results have shown how advantageous it would have been to all, and especially to the people of America, who in this way would have obtained independence without revolution and enjoyed it without anarchy."¹ Meanwhile all the American possessions of the Spanish crown, except Cuba and Porto Rico, have become independent, as predicted, and the new power, known as the United States, which at that time was a "pygmy," is a "colossus."

¹ Disertaciones, Tom. III. p. 353.

In proposing a throne for Spanish America, Aranda was preceded by no less a person than the great French engineer and fort-builder, Marshal Vauban, who, during the reverses of the War of the Spanish Succession, submitted to the court of France that Philip the Fifth should be sent to reign in America; and that prince is said to have consented.¹

Aranda was not alone in surprise at the course of Spain. The English traveller Burnaby, in his edition of 1798, mentions this as one of the reasons for the success of the Colonists, and declares that he had not supposed, originally, "that Spain would join in a plan inevitably leading, though by slow and imperceptible steps, to the final loss of all her rich possessions in South America."² This was not an uncommon idea. The same anxieties appeared in one of Mr. Adams's Dutch correspondents, whose report of fearful prophecies has been already mentioned.³ John Adams also records in his Diary, under date of 14th December, 1779, on landing at Ferrol in Spain, that, according to the report of various persons, "the Spanish nation in general have been of opinion that the Revolution in America was of bad example to the Spanish colonies, and dangerous to the interests of Spain, as the United States, if they should become ambitious, and be seized with the spirit of conquest, might aim at Mexico and Peru."⁴ All this is entirely in harmony with the Memoir of the Spanish statesman.

¹ Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XIV.*, Chap. XXI.: *Œuvres*, (édit. 1784,) Tom. XXI. p. 19.

² Travels through the Middle Settlements in North America, Preface, p. x.

³ *Ante*, p. 314.

⁴ Works, Vol. III. p. 234.

WILLIAM PALEY, 1785.

WITH the success of the American Revolution prophecy entered other spheres, and here we welcome a remarkable writer, the Rev. William Paley, an English divine, who was born July, 1743, and died 25th May, 1805. He is known for various works of great contemporary repute, all commended by a style of singular transparency, and admirably adapted to the level of opinion at the time. If they are gradually vanishing from sight, it is because other works, especially in philosophy, are more satisfactory and touch higher chords.

His earliest considerable work, and for a long period a popular text-book of education, was the well-known "Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy," which first appeared in 1785. Here, with grave errors and a reprehensible laxity on certain topics, he did much for truth. The clear vision with which he saw the enormity of Slavery was not disturbed by any prevailing interest at home, and he constantly testified against it. American Independence furnished occasion for a prophetic aspiration of more than common value, because embodied in a work of morals especially for the young:—

"The great revolution which seems preparing in the Western World may probably conduce (and who knows but that it is designed?) *to accelerate the fall of this abominable tyranny*: and when this contest, and the passions that attend it, are no more, there will succeed a season for reflecting whether a legislature which had so long lent its assistance to the support of an institution replete with human misery

was fit to be trusted with an empire the most extensive that ever obtained in any age or quarter of the world.”¹

In thus associating Emancipation with American Independence, the philosopher became an unconscious associate of Lafayette, who, on the consummation of peace, invited Washington to this beneficent enterprise,²—alas! in vain.

Paley did not confine his testimony to the pages of philosophy, but openly united with the Abolitionists of the day. To help the movement against the slave-trade, he encountered the *claim of pecuniary compensation* for the partakers in the traffic, by a brief essay, in 1789, entitled “Arguments against the Unjust Pretensions of Slave Dealers and Holders to be indemnified by Pecuniary Allowances at the Public Expense, in Case the Slave Trade should be abolished.”³ This was sent to the Abolition Committee, by whom the substance was presented to the public; but unhappily the essay was lost or mislaid.

His honorable interest in the cause was attested by a speech at a public meeting of the inhabitants of Carlisle, over which he presided, 9th February, 1792. Here he denounced the slave-trade as “this diabolical traffic,” and by a plain similitude, as applicable to slavery as to the trade in slaves, held it up to judgment:—

“None will surely plead in favor of scalping. But suppose scalps should become of request in Europe, and a trade in them be carried on with the American Indians; might

¹ Moral and Political Philosophy, (London, 1785, 4to,) Book III. Part 2, Ch. 31, *Slavery*, p. 197.

² Letter, February 5, 1783: Correspondence of the American Revolution: Letters to Washington, ed. Sparks, Vol. III. p. 547.

³ Meadley, *Memoirs of Paley*, (2d edit.,) p. 151.

it not be justly said, that the Europeans, by their trade in scalps, did all they could to perpetuate amongst the natives of America the inhuman practice of scalping?"¹

Strange that the philosopher who extenuated Duelling should have been so true and lofty against Slavery! For this, at least, he deserves our grateful praise.

ROBERT BURNS, 1788.

FROM Count Aranda to Robert Burns,—from the rich and titled minister, faring sumptuously in the best house of Paris, to the poor ploughboy poet, struggling in a cottage,—what a contrast! And there is contrast also between him and the philosopher nestling in the English Church. Of the poet I say nothing, except that he was born 25th January, 1759, and died 21st July, 1796, in the thirty-eighth year of his age.

There is only a slender thread of Burns to be woven into this web, and yet, coming from him, it must not be neglected. In a letter dated 8th November, 1788, after a friendly word for the unfortunate House of Stuart, he prophetically alludes to American Independence:—

"I will not, I cannot, enter into the merits of the case, but I dare say the American Congress in 1776 will be allowed to be as able and as enlightened as the English Convention was in 1688, *and that their posterity will celebrate the centenary of their deliverance from us as duly and sincerely as we do ours from the oppressive measures of the wrong-headed House of Stuart.*"²

¹ Meadley, *Memoirs of Paley*, (2d edit.,) Appendix G, p. 383.

² To the Editor of the *Star*: *Life and Works of Burns*, ed. Chambers, (Edinburgh, 1851-52,) Vol. II. p. 295. *Grahame's History of the United States*, (London, 1836,) Appendix, Note XXI., Vol. IV. p. 462.

The year 1788, when these words were written, was a year of commemoration, being the hundredth from the famous Revolution by which the Stuarts were excluded from the throne of England. The "centenary" of our Independence is not yet completed; but long ago the commemoration began. On the coming of that hundredth anniversary, the prophecy of Burns will be more than fulfilled.

This aspiration is in harmony with the address to George the Third in the "Dream," after the loss of the Colonies:—

"Your royal nest, beneath your wing,
Is e'en right reft and clouted,"¹—

meaning broken and patched; also with the obnoxious toast he gave at a supper, "May our success in the present war be equal to the justice of our cause";² and also with an "Ode on the American War," beginning,—

"No Spartan tube, no Attic shell,
No lyre Eolian I awake;
'Tis Liberty's bold note I swell;
Thy harp, Columbia, let me take."³

How natural for the great poet who had pictured the sublime brotherhood of man!—

"Then let us pray that come it may,
As come it will for a' that,
That man to man, the world o'er,
Shall brothers be for a' that."⁴

¹ Life and Works, ed. Chambers, Vol. I. p. 259.

² See Burns's Letter to Mr. Samuel Clarke, Jun., Dumfries: Ibid., Vol. IV. p. 57.

³ Autograph MS., in the possession of Henry Stevens, cited in his *Bibliotheca Geographica*, (London, 1872,) Part I. p. 57.

⁴ Béranger reproduced the same life-giving cosmopolitan sentiment:—

"Peuples, formez une sainte-alliance,
Et donnez-vous la main." — *La Sainte-Alliance des Peuples*.

RICHARD BRINSLEY SHERIDAN, 1794.

SHERIDAN was a genius who united the palm of eloquence in Parliament with that other palm won at the Theatre. His speeches and his plays excited equal applause. The House of Commons and Drury Lane were the scenes of his famous labors, while society enjoyed his graceful wit. He was born in Dublin, September, 1751, and died in London, July 7th, 1816.

I quote now from a speech in the House of Commons, 21st January, 1794.

"America remains neutral, prosperous, and at peace. America, with a wisdom, prudence, and magnanimity which we have disdained, thrives at this moment in a state of envied tranquillity, and *is hourly clearing the paths to unbounded opulence.* America has monopolized the commerce and the advantages which we have abandoned. Oh! turn your eyes to her; view her situation, her happiness, her content; observe her trade and her manufactures, adding daily to her general credit, to her private enjoyments, and to her public resources,—*her name and government rising above the nations of Europe with a simple, but commanding dignity, that wins at once the respect, the confidence, and the affection of the world.*"¹

Here are true respect and sympathy for our country, with a forecast of increasing prosperity, and an image of her attitude among the nations. It is pleasant to enroll the admired author of "The Rivals" and "The School for Scandal" in this catalogue.

¹ Hansard's Parliamentary History, Vol. XXX. col. 1219.

CHARLES JAMES FOX, 1794.

IN quoting from Charles James Fox, the statesman, minister, and orator, I need add nothing, except that he was born 24th January, 1749, and died 13th September, 1806, and that he was an early friend of our country.

Many words of his, especially during our Revolution, might be introduced here; but I content myself with a single passage, of later date, which, besides its expression of good-will, is a prophecy of our power. It is found in a speech in the House of Commons, on his motion for putting an end to war with France, 30th May, 1794.

"It was impossible to dissemble that we had a serious dispute with America, and although we might be confident that the wisest and best man of his age, who presided in the government of that country, would do everything that became him to avert a war, it was impossible to foresee the issue. America had no fleet, no army; but in case of war she would find various means to harass and annoy us. Against her we could not strike a blow that would not be as severely felt in London as in America, so identified were the two countries by commercial intercourse. *To a contest with such an adversary he looked as the greatest possible misfortune.* If we commenced another crusade against her, we might destroy her trade, and check the progress of her agriculture, but we must also equally injure ourselves. Desperate, therefore, indeed, must be that war in which each wound inflicted on our enemy would at the same time inflict one upon ourselves. He hoped to God that such an event as a war with America would not happen."¹

¹ Hansard's Parliamentary History, Vol. XXXI. col. 627.

All good men on both sides of the ocean must join with Fox, who thus early deprecated war between the United States and England, and portrayed the fearful consequences. Time, which has enlarged and multiplied the relations between the two countries, makes his words more applicable now than when first uttered.

ABBÉ GRÉGOIRE, 1808.

HENRI GRÉGOIRE, of France, Curate, Deputy to the States General, Constitutional Bishop, Member of the Convention, also of the Council of Five Hundred, and Senator, sometimes called Bishop, more frequently Abbé, was born 4th December, 1750, and died 28th April, 1831. To these titles add Abolitionist and Republican.

His character and career were unique, being in France what Clarkson and Wilberforce were in England, and much more, for he was not only an Abolitionist. In all history no hero of humanity stands forth more conspicuous for instinctive sympathy with the Rights of Man and constancy in their support. As early as 1788 he signalized himself by an essay, crowned by the Academy of Metz, upholding tolerance for the Jews.¹ His public life began, while yet a curate, as a representative of the clergy of Lorraine in the States General, but his sympathies with the people were at once manifest. In the engraving by which the oath in the Tennis Court is commemorated he appears in the foreground. His votes were always for the enfranchisement of the people and the improvement of their condition, his hope being "to Chris-

¹ *Essai sur la Régénération Physique, Morale et Politique des Juifs.*

tianize the Revolution.”¹ In the night session of 4th August, 1789, he declared for the abolition of privileges. He was the first to give adhesion to the civil constitution of the clergy, and himself became a constitutional bishop. The decree abolishing royalty was drawn by him, and he avows that for many days thereafter the excess of joy took from him appetite and sleep. In the discussion on the execution of the King he called for the suppression of the punishment of death. At his instance the Convention abolished African slavery. With similar energy he sustained public libraries, botanical gardens, and experimental farms. He was a founder of the Bureau of Longitudes, the *Conservatoire des Arts et Métiers*, and of the National Institute. More than any other person he contributed to prevent the destruction of public monuments, and was the first to call this crime “Vandalism,” — an excellent term, since adopted in all European languages. With similar vigor he said, in words often quoted, “Kings are in the moral order what monsters are in the physical order”; and, “The history of kings is the martyrology of nations.” He denounced “the oligarchs of all countries and all the crowned brigands who pressed down the people,” and, according to his own boast, “spat upon” duellists. “Better a loss to deplore than an injustice to reproach ourselves with,” was his lofty solace as he turned from the warning that the Colonies might be endangered by the rights he demanded.

Such a man could not reconcile himself to the Em-

¹ “Bourdon de l’Oise le caractérisa parfaitement, lorsqu’il lui reprocha, au club des Jacobins, de vouloir christianiser la révolution.” — CARNOT, *Notice Historique sur Grégoire*: Mémoires de Grégoire, (Paris, 1840,) Tom. I. p. 7.

pire or to Napoleon ; nor could he expect consideration under the Restoration. But he was constant always to his original sentiments. In 1826 he wrote a work with the expressive title, "The Nobility of the Skin, or the Prejudice of Whites against the Color of Africans and that of their Black and Mixed Descendants."¹ His life was prolonged to witness the Revolution of 1830, and shortly after his remains were borne to the cemetery of Mont Parnasse by young men, who took the horses from the hearse.²

This brief account of one little known is an introduction to signal prophecies concerning America.

As early as 8th January, 1791, in a document addressed to citizens of color and free negroes of the French islands, he boldly said :—

"A day will come when deputies of color will traverse the ocean to come and sit in the national diet, and to swear with us to live and die under our laws. A day will come when the sun will not shine among you except upon free-men, — when the rays of the light-spreading orb will no longer fall upon irons and slaves. . . . It is according to the irresistible march of events and the progress of intelligence, that all people dispossessed of the domain of Liberty will at last recover this indefeasible property."³

These strong and confident words, so early in date, were followed by others more remarkable. At the conclusion of his admirable work "*De la Littérature*

¹ *De la Noblesse de la Peau, ou du Préjugé des Blancs contre la Couleur des Africains et celle de leurs Descendants noirs et sang-mêlés.*

² The leading events of his life will be found in the two French biographical dictionaries, — *Biographie Universelle* (Michaud) and *Biographie Générale* (Didot), — where his name occupies considerable space.

³ *Lettre aux Citoyens de Couleur et Nègres Libres de Saint-Domingue, et des autres Isles Françaises de l'Amérique*, p. 12.

des Nègres," first published in 1808, where, with equal knowledge and feeling, homage is done to a people wronged and degraded by man, he cites his prediction with regard to the sun shining only upon freemen, and then, elevated by the vision, declares that "this American Continent, asylum of Liberty, is on its way towards an order of things which will be common to the Antilles, and *the course of which all the powers combined will not be able to arrest.*"¹ This vigorous language is crowned by a prophecy of singular extent and precision, where, after dwelling on the influences at work to accelerate progress, he foretells the eminence of our country:—

"When an energetic and powerful nation, to which everything presages high destinies, stretching its arms over the two oceans, the Atlantic and Pacific, shall dispatch its vessels from one to the other *by a shortened route,—whether by cutting the Isthmus of Panama, or by forming a canal of communication, as has been proposed, by the River St. John and the Lake of Nicaragua,—it will change the face of the commercial world and the face of empires.* Who knows if America will not then avenge the outrages she has received, and if our old Europe, placed in the rank of a subaltern power, will not become a colony of the New World?"²

Thus resting on the two oceans with a canal between, so that the early "secret of the strait" shall no longer exist, the American Republic will change the face of the world, and perhaps make Europe subaltern. Such was the vision of the French Abolitionist, lifted by devotion to Humanity.

¹ Littérature des Nègres, p. 282.

² Ibid., p. 283.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, 1824.

SMALL preface is needed for the testimony of Jefferson, whose life belongs to the history of his country. He was born 2d April, 1743, and died 4th July, 1826.

Contemporary and rival of Adams, the author of the Declaration of Independence surpassed the other in sympathetic comprehension of the Rights of Man, as the other surpassed him in the prophetic spirit. Jefferson's words picturing Slavery were unequalled in the prolonged discussion of that terrible subject, and his two Inaugural Addresses are masterpieces of political truth. But with clearer eye Adams foresaw the future grandeur of the Republic, and dwelt on its ravishing light and glory. The vision of our country co-extensive and coincident with the North American Continent was never beheld by Jefferson. While recognizing that our principles of government, traversing the Rocky Mountains, would smile upon the Pacific coast, his sight did not embrace the distant communities there as parts of a common country. This is apparent in a letter to John Jacob Astor, 24th May, 1812, where, referring to the commencement of a settlement by the latter on Columbia River, and declaring the gratification with which he looked forward to the time when its descendants should have spread through the whole length of that coast, he adds, "covering it with free and independent Americans, *unconnected with us but by the ties of blood and interest*, and employing, like us, the rights of self-government."¹ In another letter to Mr. Astor, 9th November, 1813, he characterizes the settlement as "the germ of a great, free, and

¹ Writings, Vol. VI. p. 55.

*independent empire on that side of our continent,"*¹ thus carefully announcing political dissociation.

But Jefferson has not been alone in blindness to the mighty capabilities of the Republic, inspired by his own Declaration of Independence. Daniel Webster, in a speech at Faneuil Hall, as late as 7th November, 1845, pronounced that the Pacific coast could not be governed from Europe, or from the Atlantic side of the Continent; and he pressed the absurdity of anything different:—

“Where is Oregon? On the shores of the Pacific, three thousand miles from us, and twice as far from England. Who is to settle it? Americans mainly; some settlers undoubtedly from England; but all Anglo-Saxons; all, men educated in notions of independent government, and all self-dependent. And now let me ask if there be any sensible man in the whole United States who will say for a moment, that, when fifty or a hundred thousand persons of this description shall find themselves on the shores of the Pacific Ocean, they will long consent to be under the rule either of the American Congress or the British Parliament. They will raise a standard for themselves, and they ought to do it.”²

Such a precise and strenuous protest from such a quarter mitigates the distrust of Jefferson. But after the acquisition of California the orator said, “I willingly admit, my apprehensions have not been realized.”³

On the permanence of the National Union, and its influence throughout the world, Jefferson prophesied thus, in a letter to Lafayette, 14th February, 1815:—

¹ Writings, Vol. VI. p. 248.

² Boston Daily Advertiser, 10th November, 1845. This speech is not found in the collected works of Mr. Webster.

³ Speech at Pilgrim Festival, New York, 1850: Works, Vol. II. p. 526.

"The cement of this Union is in the heart-blood of every American. I do not believe there is on earth a government established on so immovable a basis. Let them in any State, even in Massachusetts itself, raise the standard of separation, and its citizens will rise in mass and do justice themselves on their own incendiaries."¹

Unhappily the Rebellion shows that he counted too much on the patriotism of the States against "their own incendiaries." In the same hopeful spirit he wrote to Edward Livingston, the eminent jurist, 4th April, 1824:—

"You have many years yet to come of vigorous activity, and I confidently trust they will be employed in cherishing every measure which may foster our brotherly union and perpetuate a constitution of government *destined to be the primitive and precious model of what is to change the condition of man over the globe.*"²

In these latter words he takes his place on the platform of John Adams, and sees the world changed by our example. But again he is anxious about the Union. In another letter to Livingston, 25th March, 1825, after saying of the National Constitution, that "it is a compact of many independent powers, every single one of which claims an equal right to understand it and to require its observance," he prophesies:—

"However strong the cord of compact may be, there is a point of tension at which it will break."³

Thus, in venerable years, while watching with anxiety the fortunes of the Union, the patriarch did not fail to see the new order of ages instituted by the American Government.

¹ Writings, Vol. VI. p. 426. ² Ibid., Vol. VII. p. 344. ³ Ibid., p. 404.

GEORGE CANNING, 1826.

GEORGE CANNING was a successor of Fox, in the House of Commons, as statesman, minister, and orator. He was born 11th April, 1770, and died 8th August, 1827, in the beautiful villa of the Duke of Devonshire, at Chiswick, where Fox had died before. Unlike Fox in sentiment for our country, he is nevertheless associated with a leading event of our history, and is the author of prophetic words.

The Monroe Doctrine, as now familiarly called, proceeded from Canning. He was its inventor, promoter, and champion, at least so far as it bears against European intervention in American affairs. Earnestly engaged in counteracting the designs of the Holy Alliance for the restoration of the Spanish colonies to Spain, he sought to enlist the United States in the same policy; and when Mr. Rush, our minister at London, replied, that any interference with European politics was contrary to the traditions of the American Government, he argued, that, however just such a policy might have been formerly, it was no longer applicable, — that the question was new and complicated, — that it was “full as much American as European, to say no more,” — that “it concerned the United States under aspects and interests as immediate and commanding as it did or could any of the States of Europe,” — that “they were the first power established on that continent, and now confessedly the leading power”; and he then asked: “Was it possible that they could see with indifference their fate decided upon by Europe? . . . Had not a new epoch arrived in the relative position of the United States towards Europe, which Europe must acknowl-

edge? *Were the great political and commercial interests which hung upon the destinies of the new continent to be canvassed and adjusted in this hemisphere, without the coöperation, or even knowledge, of the United States?*"¹ With mingled ardor and importunity the British Minister pressed his case. At last, after much discussion in the Cabinet at Washington, President Monroe, accepting the lead of Mr. Canning, and with the counsel of John Quincy Adams, put forth his famous declaration, where, after referring to the radical difference between the political systems of Europe and America, he says, that "we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as *dangerous to our peace and safety*," and that, where governments have been recognized by us as independent, "we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as *the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States*."²

The message of President Monroe was received in England with enthusiastic congratulations. It was upon all tongues; the press was full of it; the securities of Spanish America rose in the market; the agents of Spanish America were happy.³ Brougham exclaimed in Parliament, that "no event had ever dispersed greater joy, exultation, and gratitude over all the freemen in

¹ Rush, Residence at the Court of London from 1819 to 1825, 2d Series, (London, 1845,) Vol. II. pp. 44, 45.

² Annual Message, December 2, 1823: State Papers, 18th Cong. 1st Sess., Doc. No. 2, p. 14.

³ Rush, Residence at the Court of London, 2d Series, Vol. II. p. 73. Wheaton's Elements of International Law, ed. Dana, pp. 97-112, note.

Europe.”¹ Mackintosh rejoiced in the coincidence of England and the United States, “the two great English commonwealths,—for so he delighted to call them; and he heartily prayed that they might be forever united in the cause of justice and liberty.”² The Holy Alliance abandoned their purposes on this continent, and the independence of Spanish America was established. Some time afterwards, on the occasion of assistance to Portugal, when Mr. Canning felt called to review and vindicate his foreign policy, he assumed the following lofty strain: this was in the House of Commons, 12th December, 1826:—

“It would be disingenuous not to admit that the entry of the French army into Spain was, in a certain sense, a disparagement, an affront to the pride, a blow to the feelings of England. . . . But I deny, that, questionable or censurable as the act might be, it was one which necessarily called for our direct and hostile opposition. Was nothing, then, to be done? . . . If France occupied Spain, was it necessary, in order to avoid the consequences of that occupation, that we should blockade Cadiz? No. I looked another way. I sought materials of compensation in another hemisphere. Contemplating Spain, such as our ancestors had known her, I resolved, that, if France had Spain, it should not be Spain ‘with the Indies.’ *I called the New World into existence, to redress the balance of the Old.*”³

If the republics of Spanish America, thus summoned into independent existence, have not contributed the weight thus vaunted, the growing power of the United

¹ Speech, February 3, 1824: Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, N. S., Vol. X. col. 68.

² Speech, June 15, 1824: *Ibid.*, Vol. XI. col. 1361.

³ Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, N. S., Vol. XVI. col. 397.

States is ample to compensate deficiencies on this continent. There is no balance of power it cannot redress.

ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE, 1835.

WITH De Tocqueville we come among contemporaries removed by death. He was born at Paris, 29th July, 1805, and died at Cannes, 16th April, 1859. Having known him personally, and seen him at his castle-home in Normandy, I cannot fail to recognize the man in his writings, which on this account have a double charm.

He was the younger son of noble parents, his father being of ancient Norman descent, and his mother granddaughter of Malesherbes, the venerated defender of Louis the Sixteenth; but his aristocratic birth had no influence to check the generous sympathies with which his heart always palpitated. In 1831 he came to America as a commissioner from the French Government to examine our prisons, but with a larger commission from his own soul to study republican institutions. His conscientious application, rare probity, penetrating thought, and refinement of style all appeared in his work, "*De la Démocratie en Amérique*," first published in 1835, whose peculiar success is marked by the fourteenth French edition now before me, and the translations into other languages. At once he was famous, and his work classical. The Academy opened its gates. Since Montesquieu there had been no equal success in the same department, and he was constantly likened to the illustrious author of "*The Spirit of Laws*." Less epigrammatic, less artful, and less French than his prototype, he was more simple, truthful, and prophetic. A second

publication in 1840, with the same title, the fruit of mature studies, presented American institutions in another aspect, exhibiting his unimpaired faith in Democracy, which with him was Equality as "first principle and symbol."¹

Entering the French Chambers, he became eminent for character, discussing chiefly those measures in which civilization is most concerned, — the reform of prisons, the abolition of slavery, penal colonies, and the pretensions of socialism. His work, "*L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution*," awakens admiration, while his correspondence is among the most charming in literature, exciting love as well as delight.

His honest and practical insight made him philosopher and prophet, which he was always. A speech in the Chambers, 27th January, 1848, was memorable as predicting the Revolution which occurred one month later. But his foresight with regard to America brings him into our procession.

His clearness of vision appears in the distinctness with which he recognized the peril from Slavery and from the pretensions of the States. And in Slavery he saw also the prolonged and diversified indignity to the African race. This was his statement:—

"The most formidable of all the evils which menace the future of the United States springs from *the presence of the blacks on their soil*. When we seek the cause of the present embarrassments and of the future dangers of the Union, from whatever point we set out, we almost always come upon this primary fact."²

¹ *Démocratie en Amérique*, (Paris, 1864,) Tom. III. Part. IV. Ch. 7, p. 527.

² *Ibid.*, Tom. II. Ch. 10, p. 302.

Then with consummate power he depicts the lot of the unhappy African, even when free : oppressed, but with whites for judges ; shut out from the jury ; his son excluded from the school which receives the descendant of the European ; unable with gold to buy a place at the theatre "by the side of him who was his master" ; in hospitals separated from the rest ; permitted to worship the same God as the whites, but not to pray at the same altar ; and when life is passed, the difference of condition prevailing still even over the equality of the grave.¹

Impressed by the menace from Slavery, he further pictures the Union succumbing to the States :—

"Either I strangely deceive myself, or the Federal Government of the United States is tending every day to grow weaker. It is withdrawing gradually from affairs ; it is contracting more and more the circle of its action. Naturally feeble, it is abandoning even the appearance of force."²

Such was the condition when De Tocqueville wrote ; and so it continued until the Rebellion broke forth, and the country rose to save the Union. Foreseeing this peril, he did not despair of the Republic, which, in his judgment, was "the natural state of the Americans,"³ with roots more profound than the Union.

In describing the future he becomes a prophet. Accepting the conclusion that the number of inhabitants doubles in twenty-two years, and not recognizing any causes to arrest this progressive movement, he foresees the colossal empire :—

"The Americans of the United States, whatever they do, will become one of the greatest people of the world ; they

¹ *Démocratie en Amérique*, Tom. II. Ch. 10, p. 307.

² *Ibid.*, p. 397.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 399.

will cover with their offshoots almost all North America. The continent which they inhabit is their domain; it cannot escape them."¹

Then, declaring that the "English race," not stopping within the limits of the Union, will advance much beyond towards the Northeast,—that at the Northwest they will encounter only Russian settlements without importance,—that at the Southwest the vast solitudes of Mexican territory will be appropriated,—and dwelling on the fortunate geographical position of "the English of America," with their climate, their interior seas, their great rivers, and the fertility of their soil, he is ready to say:—

"So, in the midst of the uncertainty of the future, there is at least one event which is certain. At an epoch which we can call near, since the question here is of the life of a people, the Anglo-Americans alone will cover all the immense space comprised between the polar ice and the tropics; they will spread from the shores of the Atlantic Ocean even to the coasts of the South Sea."²

Then, declaring that the territory destined to the Anglo-American race equals three fourths of Europe, that many centuries will pass before the different offshoots of this race will cease to present a common physiognomy, that no epoch can be foreseen when in the New World there will be any permanent inequality of conditions, and that there are processes of association and of knowledge by which the people are assimilated with each other and with the rest of the world, the prophet speaks:—

¹ *Démocratie en Amérique*, Tom. II. Ch. 10, pp. 378, 379.

² *Ibid.*, p. 428.

"There will then come a time when there will be seen in North America one hundred and fifty millions of men, equal among themselves, who will all belong to the same family, who will have the same point of departure, the same civilization, the same language, the same religion, the same habits, the same manners, and among whom thought will circulate in the same form and paint itself in the same colors. All else is doubtful, but this is certain. Now here is a fact entirely new in the world, of which imagination itself cannot grasp the import."¹

No American can fail to be strengthened in the future of the Republic by the testimony of De Tocqueville. Honor and gratitude to his memory!

RICHARD COBDEN, 1849.

COMING yet nearer to our own day, we meet a familiar name, now consecrated by death, — Richard Cobden, born 3d June, 1804, and died 2d April, 1865. In proportion as truth prevails among men, his character will shine with increasing glory until he is recognized as the first Englishman of his time. Though thoroughly English, he was not insular. He served mankind as well as England.

His masterly faculties and his real goodness made him a prophet always. He saw the future, and strove to hasten its promises. The elevation and happiness of the human family were his daily thought. He knew how to build as well as to destroy. Through him disabilities upon trade and oppressive taxes were overturned; also a new treaty was negotiated with France, quickening commerce and intercourse. He was never so truly eminent as when bringing his practical sense

¹ *Démocratie en Amérique*, Tom. II. Ch. 10, p. 430.

and enlarged experience to commend the cause of Permanent Peace in the world by the establishment of a refined system of International Justice, and the disarming of the nations. To this great consummation all his later labors tended. I have before me a long letter, dated at London, 7th November, 1849, where he says much on this absorbing question, from which, by an easy transition, he passes to speak of the proposed annexation of Canada to the United States. As what he says on the latter topic concerns America, and is a prophetic voice, I have obtained permission to copy it for this collection.

“Race, religion, language, traditions, are becoming bonds of union, and not the parchment title-deeds of sovereigns. These instincts may be thwarted for the day, but they are too deeply rooted in Nature and in usefulness not to prevail in the end. I look with less interest to these struggles of races to live apart for what they want to undo than for what they will prevent being done in future. *They will warn rulers that henceforth the acquisition of fresh territory by force of arms will only bring embarrassments and civil war,* instead of that increased strength which in ancient times, when people were passed, like flocks of sheep, from one king to another, always accompanied the incorporation of new territorial conquests.

“This is the secret of the admitted doctrine, that we shall have no more wars of conquest or ambition. In this respect *you* are differently situated, having vast tracts of unpeopled territory to tempt that cupidity which, in respect of landed property, always disposes individuals and nations, however rich in acres, to desire more. This brings me to the subject of Canada, to which you refer in your letters.

“I agree with you, that *Nature has decided that Canada and the United States must become one, for all purposes of*

free intercommunication. Whether they also shall be united in the same federal government must depend upon the two parties to the union. I can assure you that there will be no repetition of the policy of 1776, on our part, to prevent our North American colonies from pursuing their interest in their own way. If the people of Canada are tolerably unanimous in wishing to sever the very slight thread which now binds them to this country, I see no reason why, if good faith and ordinary temper be observed, it should not be done amicably. I think it would be far more likely to be accomplished peaceably, *if the subject of annexation were left as a distinct question.* I am quite sure that *we* should be gainers, to the amount of about a million sterling annually, if our North American colonists would set up in life for themselves and maintain their own establishments; and I see no reason to doubt that they also might be gainers by being thrown upon their own resources.

“The less your countrymen mingle in the controversy, the better. It will only be an additional obstacle in the path of those in this country who see the ultimate necessity of a separation, but who have still some ignorance and prejudice to contend against, which, if used as political capital by designing politicians, may complicate seriously a very difficult piece of statesmanship. It is for you and such as you, who love peace, to guide your countrymen aright in this matter. You have made the most noble contributions of any modern writer to the cause of Peace; and as a public man I hope you will exert all your influence to induce Americans to hold a dignified attitude and observe a ‘masterly inactivity’ in the controversy which is rapidly advancing to a solution between the mother country and her American colonies.”

A prudent patriotism among us will appreciate the wisdom of this counsel, more needed now than when

written. The controversy which Cobden foresaw "between the mother country and her American colonies" is yet undetermined. The recent creation of what is somewhat grandly called "The Dominion of Canada" marks one stage in its progress.

LUCAS ALAMAN, 1852.

FROM Canada I pass to Mexico, and close this list with Lucas Alaman, the Mexican statesman and historian, who has left on record a most pathetic prophecy with regard to his own country, intensely interesting to us at this moment.

Alaman was born in the latter part of the last century, and died June 2, 1855. He was a prominent leader of the monarchical party, and Minister of Foreign Affairs under Presidents Bustamente and Santa Aña. In this capacity he inspired the respect of foreign diplomatists. One of these, who had occasion to know him officially, says of him, in answer to my inquiries, that he "was the greatest statesman Mexico has produced since her independence."¹ He was one of the few in any country who have been able to unite literature with public life, and obtain honors in each.

His first work was "Dissertations on the History of the Mexican Republic,"² in three volumes, published at Mexico, 1844-49. In these he considers the original conquest by Cortés, its consequences, the conqueror and his family, the propagation of the Christian religion in New Spain, the formation of the city of Mexico, the

¹ The excellent Baron von Gerolt, for so long a period at Washington as Minister of Prussia and of the German Empire.

² *Disertaciones sobre la Historia de la República Mexicana.*

history of Spain and the House of Bourbon. All these topics are treated somewhat copiously. Then followed the "History of Mexico, from the First Movements which prepared its Independence in 1808 to the Present Epoch,"¹ in five volumes, published at Mexico, the first bearing date 1849, and the fifth 1852. From the Preface to the first volume it appears that the author was born in Guanajuato, and witnessed there the beginning of the Mexican Revolution in 1810, under Don Miguel Hidalgo, the curate of Dolores; that he was personally acquainted with the curate, and with many who had a principal part in the successes of that time; that he was experienced in public affairs, as Deputy and as member of the Cabinet; and that he had known directly the persons and things of which he wrote. His last volume embraces the government of Iturbide as Emperor, and also his unfortunate death, ending with the establishment of the Mexican Federal Republic, in 1824. The work is careful and well considered. The eminent diplomatist already mentioned, who had known the author officially, writes that "no one was better acquainted with the history and causes of the incessant revolutions in his unfortunate country, and that his work on this subject is considered by all respectable men in Mexico a *chef-d'œuvre* for purity of sentiments and patriotic convictions."

It is on account of the valedictory words of this History that I introduce the name of Alaman, and nothing more striking appears in this gallery. Behold!—

"Mexico will be, without doubt, a land of prosperity from its natural advantages, *but it will not be so for the*

¹ Historia de Méjico, desde los primeros Movimientos que prepararon su Independencia en al Año de 1808 hasta la Época presente.

racés which now inhabit it. As it seemed the destiny of the peoples who established themselves therein at different and remote epochs to perish from the face of it, leaving hardly a memory of their existence ; even as the nation which built the edifices of Palenque, and those which we admire in the peninsula of Yucatan, was destroyed without its being known what it was or how it disappeared ; *even as the Toltecs perished by the hands of barbarous tribes coming from the North,* no record of them remaining but the pyramids of Cholula and Teotihuacan ; and, finally, even as the ancient Mexicans fell beneath the power of the Spaniards, *the country gaining infinitely by this change of dominion, but its ancient masters being overthrown ;* — so likewise its present inhabitants shall be ruined and hardly obtain the compassion they have merited, and the Mexican nation of our days shall have applied to it what a celebrated Latin poet said of one of the most famous personages of Roman history, STAT MAGNI NOMINIS UMBRA,¹— Nothing more remains than the shadow of a name illustrious in another time.

“May the Almighty, in whose hands is the fate of nations, and who by ways hidden from our sight abases or exalts them according to the designs of His providence, be pleased to grant unto ours the protection by which He has so often deigned to preserve it from the dangers to which it has been exposed !”²

Most affecting words of prophecy ! Considering the character of the author as statesman and historian, it could have been only with inconceivable anguish that he made this terrible record for the land whose child and servant he was. Born and reared in Mexico, honored by its important trusts, and writing the history

¹ In the original text of Alaman this is printed in large capitals, and explained in a note as said by Lucan of Pompey (Pharsalia, I. 135).

² Historia, Tom. V. pp. 954, 955.

of its independence, it was his country, having for him all that makes country dear; and yet thus calmly he consigns the present people to oblivion, while another enters into those happy places where Nature is so bountiful. And so a Mexican leaves the door open to the foreigner.

CONCLUSION.

SUCH are prophetic voices, differing in character and importance, but all having one augury, and opening one vista, illimitable in extent and vastness. Farewell to the narrow thought of Montesquieu, that a republic can exist only in a small territory!¹ Through representation and federation a continent is not too much for practical dominion, nor is it beyond expectation. Well did Webster say, "The prophecies and the poets are with us"; and then again, "In regard to this country there is no poetry like the poetry of events, and all the prophecies lag behind their fulfilment."² But my purpose is not with the fulfilment, except as it stands forth visible to all.

Ancient prophecy foretold another world beyond the ocean, which in the mind of Christopher Columbus was nothing less than the Orient with its inexhaustible treasures. The continent was hardly known when the prophets began: poets like Chapman, Drayton, Daniel, Herbert, Cowley; economists like Child and Davenant; New-Englanders like Morrell, Ward, and Sewall; and, mingling with these, that rare genius, Sir Thomas Browne, who, in the reign of Charles the Second, while

¹ *L'Esprit des Lois*, Liv. VIII. Ch. 16.

² Speech at the Festival of the Sons of New Hampshire, November 7, 1849: *Works*, Vol. II. pp. 510, 511.

the settlements were in infancy, predicted their growth in power and civilization ; and then that rarest character, Bishop Berkeley, who, in the reign of George the First, while the settlements were still feeble and undeveloped, heralded a Western empire as "Time's noblest offspring."

These voices are general. Others more precise followed. Turgot, the philosopher and minister, saw in youth, with the vision of genius, that all colonies must at their maturity drop from the parent stem, like ripe fruit. John Adams, one of the chiefs of our own history, in a youth illumined as that of Turgot, saw the predominance of the Colonies in population and power, followed by the transfer of empire to America ; then the glory of Independence, and its joyous celebration by grateful generations ; then the triumph of our language ; and, finally, the establishment of our republican institutions over all North America. Then came the Abbé Galiani, the Neapolitan Frenchman, who, writing from Naples while our struggle was still undecided, gayly predicts the total downfall of Europe, the transmigration to America, and the consummation of the greatest revolution of the globe by establishing the reign of America over Europe. There is also Adam Smith, the illustrious philosopher, who quietly carries the seat of government across the Atlantic. Meanwhile Pownall, once a Colonial governor and then a member of Parliament, in successive works of great detail, foreshadows independence, naval supremacy, commercial prosperity, immigration from the Old World, and a new national life, destined to supersede the systems of Europe and arouse the "curses" of royal ministers. Hartley, also a member of Parliament, and

the British negotiator who signed the definitive treaty of Independence, bravely announces in Parliament that the New World is before the Colonists, and that liberty is theirs; and afterwards, as diplomatist, instructs his Government, that, through the attraction of our public lands, immigration will be quickened beyond precedent, and the national debt cease to be a burden. Aranda, the Spanish statesman and diplomatist, predicts to his king that the United States, though born a "pygmy," will some day be a "colossus," under whose influence Spain will lose all her American possessions except only Cuba and Porto Rico. Paley, the philosopher, hails our successful revolution as destined to accelerate the fall of Slavery, which he denounces as an "abominable tyranny." Burns, the truthful poet, who loved mankind, looks forward a hundred years, and beholds our people rejoicing in the centenary of their independence. Sheridan pictures our increasing prosperity, and the national dignity winning the respect, confidence, and affection of the world. Fox, the liberal statesman, foresees the increasing might and various relations of the United States, so that a blow aimed at them must have a rebound as destructive as itself. The Abbé Grégoire, devoted to the slave, whose freedom he predicts, describes the power and glory of the American Republic, resting on the two great oceans, and swaying the world. Tardily, Jefferson appears with anxiety for the National Union, and yet announcing our government as the primitive and precious model to change the condition of mankind. Canning, the brilliant orator, in a much-admired flight of eloquence, discerns the New World, with its republics just called into being, redressing the balance of the Old. De Tocqueville, while

clearly foreseeing the peril from Slavery, proclaims the future grandeur of the Republic, covering "almost all North America," and making the continent its domain, with a population, equal in rights, counted by the hundred million. Cobden, whose fame will be second only to that of Adam Smith among all in this catalogue, calmly predicts the separation of Canada from the mother country by peaceable means. Alaman, the Mexican statesman and historian, announces that Mexico, which has already known so many successive races, will hereafter be ruled by yet another people, taking the place of the present possessors; and with these prophetic words, the patriot draws a pall over his country.

All these various voices, of different times and lands, mingle and intertwine in representing the great future of our Republic, which from small beginnings has already become great. It was at first only a grain of mustard-seed, "which, indeed, is the least of all seeds; but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof." Better still, it was only a little leaven, but it is fast leavening the whole continent. Nearly all who have prophesied speak of "America" or "North America," and not of any limited circle, colony, or state. It was so, at the beginning, with Sir Thomas Browne, and especially with Berkeley. During our Revolution, the Colonies struggling for independence were always described by this continental designation. They were already "America," or "North America," (and such was the language of Washington,) thus incidentally foreshadowing that coming time when the whole continent, with all its various states, shall be a Plural Unit, with one Constitution, one Liberty, and

one Destiny. The theme was also taken up by the poet, and popularized in the often quoted lines,—

“No pent-up Utica contracts your powers,
But the whole boundless continent is yours.”¹

Such grandeur may justly excite anxiety rather than pride, for duties are in corresponding proportion. There is occasion for humility also, as the individual considers his own insignificance in the transcendent mass. The tiny polyp, in unconscious life, builds the everlasting coral. Each citizen is little more than the industrious insect. The result is reached by the continuity of combined exertion. Millions of citizens, working in obedience to Nature, can accomplish anything.

Of course, war is an instrumentality which true civilization disowns. Here some of our prophets have erred. Sir Thomas Browne was so much overshadowed by his own age, that his vision was darkened by “great armies,” and even “hostile and piratical assault” on Europe. It was natural that Aranda, schooled in worldly life, should imagine the new-born power ready to seize the Spanish possessions. Among our own countrymen, Jefferson looked to war for the extension of dominion. The Floridas, he says on one occasion, “are ours in the first moment of the first war, and until a war they are of no particular necessity to us.”² Happily they were acquired in another way. Then again, while declaring that no constitution was ever before so calculated as ours for extensive empire and self-government, and insisting upon Canada as a component

¹ By Jonathan M. Sewall, in an epilogue to Addison's Tragedy of “Cato,” written in 1778 for the Bow Street Theatre, Portsmouth, N. H.

² Letter to President Madison, April 27, 1809: Writings, Vol. V. p. 444.

part, he calmly says that this "would be, of course, in the first war."¹ Afterwards, while confessing a longing for Cuba, "as the most interesting addition which could ever be made to our system of States," he says that he is "sensible that this can never be obtained, even with her own consent, but by war."² Thus at each stage is the baptism of blood. In much better mood the poet Bishop recognized empire as moving gently in the pathway of light. All this is much clearer now than when he prophesied.

It is easy to see that empire obtained by force is unrepblican, and offensive to the first principle of our Union, according to which all just government stands only on the consent of the governed. Our country needs no such ally as war. Its destiny is mightier than war. Through peace it will have everything. This is our talisman. Give us peace, and population will increase beyond all experience; resources of all kinds will multiply infinitely; arts will embellish the land with immortal beauty; the name of Republic will be exalted, until every neighbor, yielding to irresistible attraction, seeks new life in becoming part of the great whole; and the national example will be more puissant than army or navy for the conquest of the world.

¹ Letter to President Madison, April 27, 1809: Writings, Vol. V. p. 444.

² Letter to President Monroe, October 24, 1823: *Ibid.*, Vol. VII. pp. 316, 317. See also letters to same, dated June 11 and 23, 1823: *Ibid.*, pp. 238, 299.



144599

HUS.C.

S956

Author Sumner, Charles

Title Complete works. Vol.15

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

Do not
remove
the card
from this
Pocket.

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

